Paul's Independent Academy Presents: The R3X Course

Last Updated October 10, 2007

Welcome. This book contains the new R3X Course based on Robert Ducharme's write-ups, sometimes slightly edited for the sake of clarity.
The main write-up has been available since 2000, with a major update in 2003. This is the first time that all these write-ups have been compiled and a proper checksheet written and issued. I hope you find it all useful.
The articles/issues were mainly written between 2000-2007. They have been arranged by topic to make the compilation into a course pack. The checksheet is the program for how to study the course. It includes demonstrations and drills in order to better duplicate and apply the materials.
All the issues listed in the content table are on the checksheet. If studied on screen, you will find each issue linked from the content table as well as from the checksheet. Using the checksheet, you can quickly find the materials from there and do the actions the checksheet calls for. When you are ready to study R3X for application, you should have a printed version of checksheet and course materials and sign off each point studied and completed on the checksheet.

Note: R3X is an evolving subject. For latest updates, check: www.freewebs.com/paulsr3x
and the R3X Yahoo Group: groups.yahoo.com/group/Dianetic_R3X_Discussion/

Paul Adams
fzglobalguy@yahoo.com
www.fzglobal.org

Copyright ©1989-2007 by Robert Ducharme. All rights reserved.
Checksheet and marked items © 2006 by Paul Adams.
Disclaimer: This course and its materials are not connected to or endorsed by the Church of Scientology. Dianetics® and Scientology® are service marks and trademarks owned by Religious Technology Center, and permission was not sought for their fair use.

The R3X Course
Content Table:

I. Introduction to R3X

Course Checksheet (12/18/06) 5
R3X as a Total Tech (12/5/03) 17
R3XD Name Change (11/12/03) 19
Meter TA Knob Preparation (4/20/04) 20
Name Update (12/7/05) 21

II. Starting Off–This Lifetime R3X

Starting R3X (8/2/04) 22
Six-Direction Process not as Tiring (4/26/02) 24
Lock Scanning in R3X (4/23/02) 25
R3X on a Child (5/27/02) 27
Lifetime Clearing (4/20/03) 28
Running Rudiments with R3X (6/19/03) 30
Charged Terminal RD (12/24/03) 32
Six-Direction Process Shortens Time Spent in Handling Chains (5/21/04) 35
Shock Moment Handling (4/20/03) 37
Lifetime Scanning (8/8/04) 39

III. Full R3X Procedure

R3X Procedure (4/20/03) 42
Special Attention Process (8/26/04) 55
Handling Entities (9/7/06) 58
Additional Step for Shock Moment Handling (12/18/06) 61

IV. Additional Data Regarding R3X Procedure

Additional R3X Notes (4/20/03) 63
Additional Processes (4/20/03) 73
Other Topics (4/20/03) 74

Dramatizations (10/10/03) 75
Do The Usual (4/19/02) 76

V. Recap of R3X Procedure

Abridged Recap of R3X (4/20/03) 77
Differences Between R3R and R3X (4/20/03) 80
Shift Handling Checklist (4/20/03) 82

VI. C/S'ing and Programming

R3X: Auditing the Dynamics (4/20/03) 84
Possible Items (2/25/03) 85
A Rehab with R3X (7/28/03) 89
Tone Scale Items (2/23/04) 90
New Pc Assessment (9/12/04) 91
New Pc Program (5/16/07) 92

VII. Telephone Auditing and Telepathic Metering

Telepathic Metering (6/28/04) 94
Telepathic Metering 1 (10/30/03) 97
Telepathic Metering 2 (11/14/03) 98
Telepathic Metering 3 (4/26/02) 99
Telepathic Metering 4 (4/26/02) 100
Telepathic Metering 5 (9/5/03) 101

VIII. Auditing R3X as a Career

Auditing Business Idea (9/26/02) 103
Auditing as a Career (8/28/04) 104

IX. Appendix

Command Sheets 106
Glossary 109

Paul's Independent Academy:
Dianetic R3X Checksheet

Version 1.3P Print Version, December 2006.
Sept.14, 2004. Revised Sept. 21, 2004. Re-revised Dec. 7, 2005, and Sept. 9, 2006, and Dec. 18, 2006.
This checksheet is based on Robert Ducharme's write-ups on R3X that are currently webbed at www.freewebs.com/paulsr3x

PRE-REQUISITES:
1. Student Hat or Clearbird equivalent (NOT the BSM or equivalent) Student sign_____
2. Full TRs Course (0-9) Student sign_____
3. Metering Course Student sign_____
4. Book One Course or similar Student sign_____
5. HSDC or NED Course Student sign_____
6. Is in PT competent at Study Tech, TRs, metering and basic Dianetic auditing with full admin R3X Course Sup sign_____

BRUSH-UP: Before starting this checksheet, the student must be a competent student and auditor. There is NO basic auditor training on this course--no meter drills, no Auditor's Code, no Auditor Admin--only items about R3X. If the student needs any brush-up on Study Tech, Metering, Basic Auditing, or Dianetic theory as covered on a regular Dianetic Course like NED, this must be done before starting this course.

HOW THIS COURSE IS STUDIED: Study Tech is to be applied in full throughout this course. "Demo" would usually mean just drawing something out in a diagram for oneself. It could include working something out in clay for oneself--it does not need to be checked out by another. Per the PL "Use of Demonstration", it does NOT mean shuffling a few paper clips around. The clay demos are checked out by the supervisor, and are marked "Sup pass" accordingly. The theory items marked "Student" (in the onscreen version, not the print one) need to be understood by the student, but are not star-rated. All the items marked *rate (*Article in the print version) are to be *rated, with no fast flow allowed. No exceptions. This includes anyone labeled "fast flow" or "superliterate" or anything else. Some drills are done by the student alone; some with a coach. Drills are continued until the student can perform perfect procedure at length. The purpose is to equip the student to deal correctly with

whatever may come up in an R3X session. Many drills on this course are done by the student without a coach. In these drills, the completed worksheets are passed by the supervisor. The final drill MUST also be passed by the supervisor. No exceptions.

Student's Name_____

Date Started_____ Date Completed_____

The sign-off lines are for the person concerned to put his initials and date. The date is important, and it should be clear what the year is although it is not necessary to repeat it on each line. "PA 8/22" or similar is what is intended. The pre-printed "N/A" on a sign-off line means "Not Applicable". But every one of the blank sign-off lines is applicable, and each one needs to be signed and dated by the person concerned, depending on which column it is in.

			Initials		Date
			Stdnt	Coach	Sup
		SECTION ONE: INTRODUCTION TO R3X			
1 .	*Article	12/5/03 R3X as a Total Tech	___	___	___
2 .	Demo	What you will be able to handle as an R3X Auditor	___	___	___
3 .	Demo	Who you will be able to help as an R3X Auditor	___	___	___
4 .	Article	11/12/03 R3XD Name Change	___	___	___
5 .	Demo	The difference between R3X and R3XD		___	___
6 .	Article	4/20/04 Meter TA Knob Preparation	___	___	___
7 .	Practical	Cut a plastic disc and affix it to the TA knob of your meter, per the article.	___	___	___
8 .	Article	12/7/05 Name Update	___	___	___

SECTION TWO: STARTING OFF--THIS LIFETIME R3X

1 .	*Article	8/2/04 Starting R3X	___	___	___
2 .	Demo	Simple R3X procedure on a this-lifetime incident	___	___	___
3 .	Drill	Simple R3X procedure on a this-lifetime incident, with a doll, meter, and keeping admin including the 6-Dir shorthand:			
		1. Have Pc locate the incident, spot duration, move through, recount it, all with no problems	___	___	___
		2. Run the Six-Direction procedure to EP, all with no problems	___	___	___
		3. Have Pc move through incident again, and then run 6-Dir process, a couple of times to VGIs, all with no problems.		___	___
		4. Have Pc locate the incident, spot duration, move through it, recount it, it's scanty or occluded.	___	___	___
		5. Run the Before/After process to EP, then continue with steps 1 and 2 as usual to EP.	___	___	___
		6. Drill TR-4ing the Pc on any aspect of the incident still remaining, and handling it with 6-Dir as usual.	___	___	___
4 .	Article	4/26/02 Six-Direction Process not as Tiring	___	___	___
5 .	*Article	4/23/02 Lock Scanning in R3X	___	___	___
6 .	Demo	Demo the advantages of lock scanning over single-incident technique	___	___	___
7 .	Clay Demo	Scanning out various subject tracks of the Pc's with R3X	___	___	___
8 .	Article	5/27/02 R3X on a Child	___	___	___
9 .	Demo	Running a lower gradient than lock-scanning: 6-Dir on a charged terminal to EP; then 6-Dir on the terminal and Pc together to EP; then 6-Dir on the period of time.	___	___	___

10 .	*Article	4/20/03 Lifetime Clearing	___	___	___
11 .	Demo	Finding charged terminals and associated periods of time from the Pc, and running them with R3X (6-Dir and scanning)	___	___	___
12 .	*Article	6/19/03 Running Rudiments with R3X	___	___	___
13 .	Drill	Use a doll and a meter and worksheets, but no coach. Handle an out-rudiment situation with the Pc by moving through the appropriate recent period of time once; do the 6-Dir process; then move through the recent period of time until flat.	___	___	___
14 .	*Article	12/24/03 Charged Terminal RD	___	___	___
15 .	Drill	Use a doll and meter and worksheets, but no coach for all this series of drills. They are drills in getting familiar with the patter. Drill finding out from the Pc a list of charged terminals and determining which one to address first.	___	___	___
		Immediately running the 6-Dir process on that terminal, preferably in the general version, before starting any of the scanning procedure	___	___	___
		Establishing the span of time (in this lifetime) to be addressed	___	___	___
		Explaining to the Pc what is expected on Flows 2 and 3	___	___	___
		Running R3X on that terminal for the first period of time on Flow 1	___	___	___
		Running R3X on that terminal for the next periods of time on Flow 1	___	___	___
		Running R3X on that terminal for the periods of time on Flow 2; then 3; then 0	___	___	___
16 .	*Article	5/21/04 Six-Direction Process Shortens Time Spent in Handling Chains	___	___	___

17 .	Drill	Use a doll and meter and worksheets, but no coach for this drill. Drill the patter for running all terminals associated with an item on the 6-Dir process.	___	___	___
18 .	Drill	Using a doll and meter and worksheets but no coach, drill unburdening the dynamics with the 6-Dir process.	___	___	___
19 .	*Article	4/20/03 Shock Moment Handling	___	___	___
20 .	Demo	Handling a heavy this-lifetime shock moment that hasn't otherwise resolved	___	___	___
21 .	*Article	8/8/04 Lifetime Scanning	___	___	___
22 .	Demo	Demo when you would need to interrupt Lifetime Scanning to do R3X on a single incident	___	___	___
23 .	Drill	Lifetime Scanning, with a doll, meter and worksheets and a coach. The coach indicates TA motion and no-motion and answers for the doll. Drill using the full wording for the commands as you would with a real Pc.	___	___	___
		1. Scanning out a recent period of time the Pc has been complaining about, including the 6-Dir Process.	___	___	___
		2. Scanning out the past week, or month, including the 6-Dir Process.	___	___	___
		3. Scanning out this year so far from the beginning of the year, including the 6-Dir Process.	___	___	___
		4. Scanning out the period of time that the Pc has known a particular (charged) terminal, including the 6-Dir Process.	___	___	___
		5. Scanning the first ten years of life, from birth on, no flows, including the 6-Dir Process.	___	___	___
		6. Scanning the above, but starting with the 6-Dir Process on the period of time.	___	___	___
		7. Scanning the above, but starting with the 6-Dir Process on heavily charged terminals, either singly or as a group.	___	___	___

		8. Lifetime scanning, in ten year increments, on Flow 1, with the 6-Dir Process as usual.	___	___	___
		9. Lifetime scanning, in ten year increments for flow 2, then 3, then 0.	___	___	___
		10. Handling a heavy this-lifetime shock moment that hasn't otherwise resolved	___	___	___
		SECTION THREE: FULL R3X PROCEDURE			
1 .	Demo	Each command of R3X Procedure as you are studying it (remember, these are diagram-type demos and not shuffling paper clips around)	___	___	___
2 .	*Article	4/20/03 R3X Procedure	___	___	___
3 .	Drill	Full R3X procedure, including the Shift handling. Use a doll, meter and worksheets, but no coach. The main purpose of this drill is to get familiar with the patter and procedure.	___	___	___
4 .	*Article	8/26/04 Special Attention Process	___	___	___
5 .	Clay Demo	Why these additional commands (Special Attention Process) can dig up more charge after the Pc says the incident is "flat".	___	___	___
6 .	Drill	With a doll, meter and worksheets but no coach, drill using the Special Attention Process:			
		1. After "flattening" an incident with General R3X, running with the Blank Command (plus the usual 6-Dir process)	___	___	___
		2. ...the Effort Command...	___	___	___
		3. ...the Emotion Command...	___	___	___
		4. ...the Thought Command...	___	___	___
		5. ...the Comm Line Command...	___	___	___
7 .	*Article	9/7/06 Handling Entities	___	___	___

8 .	Drill	With a doll, meter and worksheets but no coach, drill Entity Handling	___	___	___
9 .	*Article	12/18/06 Additional Step for Shock Moment Handling	___	___	___

SECTION FOUR: ADDITIONAL DATA RE R3X PROCEDURE

1 .	Demo	As you are studying the next issue, demo the important points of EACH of the 32 headed sections.	___	___	___
2 .	*Article	4/20/03 Additional Notes	___	___	___
3 .	Article	4/20/03 Additional Processes	___	___	___
4 .	Article	4/20/03 Other Topics	___	___	___
5 .	Demo	The benefits/liabilities of not indicating F/Ns in R3X	___	___	___
6 .	Article	10/10/03 Dramatizations	___	___	___
7 .	Article	4/19/02 Do The Usual	___	___	___

SECTION FIVE: RECAP OF R3X PROCEDURE

1 .	Article	4/20/03 Abridged Recap of R3X	___	___	___
2 .	Article	4/20/03 Differences Between R3R and R3X	___	___	___
3 .	Article	4/20/03 Shift Handling Checklist	___	___	___
4 .	Demo	Using the Shift-handling checklist when you are very familiar with the procedure to make sure you don't omit a step on a Pc	___	___	___

SECTION SIX: C/S'ING, PROGRAMMING

1 .	Article	4/20/03 R3X: Auditing the Dynamics	___	___	___
2 .	Article	2/25/03 Possible Items	___	___	___

3 .	Article	7/28/03 A Rehab with R3X	___	___	___
4 .	Article	2/23/04 Tone Scale Items	___	___	___
5 .	Article	9/12/04 New Pc Assessment	___	___	___
6 .	Demo	Where to get items to run on a Pc. Include two-way comm on the Pc's current life.	___	___	___
7 .	Essay	How an auditor could never run out of items to run on a Pc if the Pc remains willing to be audited.	___	___	___
8.	Article	5/9/07 New Pc Program (New Addition)	___	___	___

SECTION SEVEN: TELEPHONE AUDITING AND TELEPATHIC METERING

1 .	Article	6/28/04 Telepathic Metering	___	___	___
2 .	Article	10/30/03 Telepathic Metering 1	___	___	___
3 .	Article	11/14/03 Telepathic Metering 2	___	___	___
4 .	Article	4/26/02 Telepathic Metering 3	___	___	___
5 .	Article	4/26/02 Telepathic Metering 4	___	___	___
6 .	Article	9/5/03 Telepathic Metering 5	___	___	___
7 .	Clay Demo	Telepathic Metering and how the mechanics of it might work	___	___	___
8 .	Drill	1. Face to face, COACH holding cans (plugged into the meter), student produces needle actions on coach as in E-Meter Drill 16 (The Production of Needle Actions), mainly trying to produce falls, until he knows he can get reading items on the coach.	___	___	___
		2. Face to face, COACH holding cans, student assesses lists by Tone Arm (as in E-Meter Drill 23) until he knows he can get reading items on the coach. Use any lists.	___	___	___

		3. Face to face, STUDENT holding cans, student produces needle actions on coach as in E-Meter Drill 16, mainly trying to produce falls, until he knows he can get reading items on the coach (the coach's items reading, not the student's, while the student is hooked up to the meter). If the student has a dirty needle getting in the way, clean it as in E-Meter Drill 17 and 20. Coach must also ensure student's TR-0 is in on the coach. If needed, False Data Strip the subject of telepathic metering, including studying a simple text on the subject, but this is not a mandatory step before attempting the drill.	___	___	___
		4. Face to face, STUDENT holding cans, student assesses lists on coach by Tone Arm until he knows he can get reading items on the coach.	___	___	___
		5. Using a telephone, not in the same room, STUDENT holding cans, student produces needle actions on coach until he knows he can get reading items on the coach.	___	___	___
		6. Using a telephone, not in the same room, the student holding the cans, student assesses lists on coach by Tone Arm until he knows he can get reading items on the coach.	___	___	___
		7. Repeat drills 5 and 6 with a different coach, doing earlier drills 4, 3, 2, 1 if needed with the new coach to get through drills 5 and 6.	___	___	___
		8. Repeat drill 7 with a third coach or as many as needed. The purpose of the drill is not to "find coaches who read well" but to demonstrate to the student that remote metering is possible on almost anyone.	___	___	___
		9. When you know with certainty that you can do telepathic auditing, and the Supervisor agrees, get a Sup Pass on it.	___	___	___

SECTION EIGHT: AUDITING R3X AS A CAREER

1 .	Article	9/26/02 Auditing Business Idea	___	___	___
2 .	*Article	8/28/04 Auditing as a Career	___	___	___
3 .	Demo	How auditing others relates to the greatest good	___	___	___
4 .	Essay	How one could make a living as an R3X auditor and whether this would be beneficial	___	___	___

SECTION NINE: FINAL THEORY DRILL

1 .	Drill	With a coach, meter, worksheets and full admin, drill full R3X procedure until confident and competent. The drilling can cover anything studied on the course, but must as a minimum include:			
		1. Running this-lifetime R3X on a new person, encompassing:			
		1A. Assessment (by meter and/or interest) for charged terminals and items	___	___	___
		1B. Running with lock-scanning and 6-Dir both generally and with four flows	___	___	___
		1C. Handling a heavy shock-moment that doesn't resolve with simple R3X handling	___	___	___
		1D. A Charged-Terminal Rundown	___	___	___
		2. Full R3X Procedure, encompassing:			
		2A. R3X procedure going whole-track on routine incidents	___	___	___
		2B. Use of the Special Attention Process on heavily-charged incidents/implants	___	___	___
		2C. Full Shift-handling procedure in the Basic-Basic area	___	___	___
		2D. R3XD: Auditing the Dynamics procedure	___	___	___
	Drill	Sup gives pass when he is confident student can do all the procedure. Sup does not have to witness the student doing every single little piece that the coach drills.	___	___	___

SECTION TEN: PRACTICAL

Note: Students may audit other students for their auditing requirements, except for item #5, which requires a raw Pc.

1 .	Practical	Audit R3X this lifetime on someone, face-to-face or remotely, to a good result. This may take one session or it may take more than one session.	___	___	___
2 .	Practical	Audit full R3X procedure including the full Shift handling on someone, face-to-face or remotely, to a good result. This may take several sessions.	___	___	___
3 .	Practical	Receive R3X procedure, remotely by telephone, to a result and the personal certainty that it works.	___	___	___
4 .	Practical	Audit full R3X procedure on someone, including the full Shift handling, remotely by telephone, to a good result.	___	___	___
5 .	Practical	Procure a non-Scio raw-meat Pc yourself, through your own out-reach actions, and audit him/her on R3X, by telephone with remote metering, to a good result.	___	___	___

SECTION ELEVEN: COURSE COMPLETION

STUDENT ATTEST: I have applied study tech throughout this course and I have honestly completed every item of this checksheet, as well as its prerequisites, and I am confident I can audit any normal person on R3X.

Signature_____ Date_____

THEORY SUPERVISOR ATTEST: I have trained this student to the best of my ability, and he/she is competent to audit any normal person on R3X.

Signature_____ Date_____

AUDITING SUPERVISOR ATTEST: I have supervised this student's auditing on this course, and he/she has demonstrated competence at auditing R3X and has completed each of the practical requirements of this checksheet.

Signature_____ Date_____

CASE SUPERVISOR ATTEST: I have C/S'd this student's auditing on this course, and he/she has demonstrated competence at auditing R3X and has completed each of the practical requirements of this checksheet.

Signature_____ Date_____

Optional: QUAL CHECK if there is a separate Student Examiner/Review section:

QUAL IN:
Signature_____ Date_____

QUAL OUT:
Signature_____ Date_____

Return checksheet to the student for safe-keeping.

R3X Checksheet version 1.3P Print Version. September 14, 2004 Revised September 21, 2004, Re-revised December 7, 2005, Re-revised September 9, 2006, Re-revised December 18, 2006

Copyright ©2004-6 by Paul Adams
http://www.fzglobal.org

END OF CHECKSHEET

The December 2005 revision was to incorporate the name change of the six direction process; no other changes were made. The September 2006 revision added a recent article on Handling Entities. The December 2006 revision added a recent article on Additional Shock Moment Handling. This checksheet may be copied for personal use in the Freezone, but may not be published in any form (e. g. in print, on a web site, on a CD or DVD) without the express written permission of the author. The only locations authorized to display this checksheet are Paul's Independent Academy and Paul's R3X. If any others are authorized, they will be listed here. Please report any offenders to the author.

Paul's Independent Academy Presents:

R3X as a Total Tech

By Robert Ducharme
December 5, 2003

From a post to the R3X thread on
the Freezone America Discussion Board:
Posted December 05, 2003.

R3X As the Complete Tech

R3X is not everything, but it is a complete tech. By that I mean that a Standard Dianetic auditor with no other training could apply nothing but R3X and handle anything a Pc could come up with. Rudiments needed? Scan out the recent past. Life repair needed? Scan out periods of time with regards to certain subjects, like relationships, parents, school, work, etc. Rudiments going out during session? Scan the session out and take it from there. Entities bothering the Pc? Just continue to run the incident until the entity is freed. There are, of course, several ways of directly handling entities if need be, which from my experience, rarely happens, and which I won't go into here. Issues hard to come by? Scanning out the present lifetime section by section will keep the Pc busy improving his case until his ability rises to where he can tackle past lives.

What I'm saying is that one could practice as an R3X auditor, using nothing else, and be able to handle anything and everything that the Pc comes up with. And the need for a separate C/S is not absolute. Because of the simplicity of the approach, one can do quite well C/Sing his own work. Non-Clear auditors would probably be better off using a C/S, however.

Not only that, but with R3X, one can handle every level from "raw meat" *former* mental patients (don't want to deal with people while they're still on medications) to high level pre-OTs who've completed their bridges. And to tell you the truth, I find such former mental patients to be among the best Pcs. They tend to have plenty of obvious issues to work on, make noticeable gains, and are extremely grateful for the service provided, having already experienced the best the psychs had to offer, which is pitifully little and still in the dark ages. I have two such persons on my lines at this time (referrals from Dr. Herring) and they are both making excellent progress.

What all that means is that anybody who is a Dianetic auditor could make a viable practice out of auditing. Yes, I believe in training even though I don't deliver it myself, but that's easily

available, whether in Sedona, or with the Metapsychology people (www.tir.org), or with any of a number of Free Zone groups.

The Free Zone can debate issues until Doomsday, but things will only start happening on a large scale when each individual in the Free Zone takes up the responsibility by either getting trained, training, auditing, receiving auditing, promoting the tech, or any combination of those. What I've done is outline a very simple, relatively quick, yet very effective way in which that could be done.

Robert D.

Paul's Independent Academy Presents:

R3XD Name Change

By Robert Ducharme
November 12, 2003

From a post to the R3X thread on
the Freezone America Board:
Posted November 12, 2003.

I've decided to change the name of the R3XD process to R3X, or Routine 3 Expanded. This is to clear up any confusion on what it is.
The original intention by Revenius was to run the dynamics with an engram-running technique. He had stated as much in his posts and I dismissed it at the time thinking it couldn't be right because it would encompass too much and would most likely be overwhelming or run too shallow. So I wound up just writing up the process I was doing at the time and called *that* R3XD. Exactly one year later, a client, a non-Scio psychic lady who had never heard of Revenius and little about Scn, told me that a being she perceived to be Ron was telling her he wanted me to run my process on the dynamics. The attempt to convey a message despite the lady's lack of knowledge of Scn concepts like "dynamics" was not the most simple to do. But to make a long story short, I eventually understood and afterwards applied it - with phenomenal success.

So now I would like to make R3XD the process where the dynamics are run, as originally intended, and R3X the basic process itself as run on any item, whether all the way through to the Shift or not. That way, the original intent of the term can be applied and put into proper perspective, and a distinction can be made between that and the basic process used.

My apologies for any further confusion this change might cause.

Robert D.

Paul's Independent Academy Presents:

Meter TA Knob Preparation

By Robert Ducharme
April 20, 2004

From a post to the
Freezone America Board:
Posted April 20, 2004.

Making a disk for the Clarity Meter
I've been using a clear plastic disk with my Clarity meter for a long time. It helps me to make use of the higher bands of the sensitivity setting with far better control of the needle than otherwise.

Making it is really simple. One goes to a grocery store bakery section and picks up some baked goods in a plastic container with a flat clear plastic surface at least 5 inches in diameter.

Remove the tone arm knob by unscrewing with small screwdriver.

Mark a circle on the plastic with a pointy magic marker (preferably the erasable kind). This can be done by tracing around something circular like a masking tape roll or a magnifying glass. Mine is 4" in diameter and extends beneath the bottom of the meter by a bit over a half inch. Then find the exact center of the disk area and punch a hole in the middle with a sharp instrument like an awl and cut out a hole the size of the knob the tone arm rests on with a knife or razor blade. Dead center can also be found by tracing the circle using a compass.

Then double-side tape the tone arm to the disk, and replace the tone arm with disk onto the meter.

Next, enjoy your croissants (or whatever) while testing out your new tone arm disk. :-)

Robert Ducharme

Paul's Independent Academy Presents:

Name Update

By Paul Adams

December 7, 2005

The six direction process was formerly called the "Over/Under" process and the "Above/Below" process. It is the same process, but the names have changed. With Robert's approval, I have changed the name of this process retroactively throughout all the articles that make up this checksheet. Only the name has been changed, not the procedure. The current name is the most descriptive and least confusing one.

Sometimes the full **"Six-Direction Process"** will be used;
sometimes it will be abbreviated to **"6-Dir"**.

Paul

Paul's Independent Academy Presents:

Starting R3X

By Robert Ducharme

August 2, 2004

As I mentioned previously, one way to get started on R3X would be to simply find an incident on a Pc (an abbreviation which could stand for processee or processing client and not necessarily pre-clear).
The procedure is simple. Just start a session as you normally would, and find an isolated incident like a divorce, a death in the family, an upsetting event, etc. Run the incident just as you would any narrative incident, except for the additional options. Remember that with R3X you always have the option of sticking strictly with R3R procedure too. R3X simply gives you the additional options that have been time-tested and proven to work standardly in Pc after Pc.
If you were to run the incident R3X style, the procedure would go something like this:

Auditor: *"Move to that incident."*
Pc: *"Okay"*.
Auditor: *"What is the duration of the incident?"*
Auditor: *"Move to a point just before the incident began."*
Pc: *"Okay."*
Auditor: *"Good." "Move through to the end of the incident."*
Pc: (scans through the incident) *"Okay"*.
Auditor: *"Alright. What happened?"*
Pc: (tells auditor what took place)

(At this point the auditor has the option of using the 6-Dirrection Process if the Pc's data is too scant or occluded. This is done to a release point.)

Auditor: *"Okay. Now get that incident and put it above you"*.
Pc: *"Yes"*.
Auditor: *"Good. Put it below you"*.
Pc: *"Yes"*.
Auditor: *"Good. Put it to the right of you"*.
Pc: *"Yes"*.
Auditor: *"Good. Put it to the left of you"*.
Pc: *"Yes"*.
Auditor: *"Good. Put it in front of you"*.
Pc: *"Yes"*.

Auditor: *"Good. Put it in back of you".*
Pc: *"Yes".*
Auditor: *"Good. Put it above you"*
Pc: *"Yes".* etc., etc., etc. done to a release and flat point.
Then...
Auditor: *"Move to the beginning of the incident".* (The Pc should know to move to the same point as before)
Pc: *"Okay"*
Auditor: *"Good." "Move through to the end of the incident."*
Pc: *"Okay"*
Auditor: *"Good. What occurred that time?"*
(The question can be varied as "What came up that time?", "What did you get?", etc. The idea is that the auditor wants to know what the Pc *newly* saw as he scanned through, not necessarily the whole story parroted back.)

By this time the incident should be flat and the Pc should have VGIs. If it's not, it's okay to use TR-4 and query the Pc as to what aspects of the incident are left. Then the 6-Dir process is used again, followed by another scanning. This is done until all the charge in the incident has vanished. If, in the rare case where there appears to be any lingering bad feeling to the incident, the auditor can ask the Pc if the charge is coming from that incident or an earlier (or another) one. If it's still coming from that incident, then it's safe to go through the procedure again. Otherwise, running the earlier similar incident would probably be the next thing to do.
If you want to do a narrative 4 flows, fine. I'm not that concerned about getting 4 flows in on this-lifetime narrative incidents. Besides, doing Lifetime Scanning 4 flows would cover pretty much anything from this lifetime that needs to be run. A system of notation I use for the 6-Dir process is the following done on letter-sized college ruled paper.
A |||| |
B |||| |
R |||| |
L ||||
F ||||
B ||||

Robert D.

Paul's Independent Academy Presents:

Six-Direction Process Not as Tiring

By Robert Ducharme
April 26, 2002

From a post to the R3X thread on the
Freezone America Board: April 26, 2002
[Ed. note--Revised to replace "Over/Under"
with current name of "Six-Direction Process"]

Dianetic auditing is peculiar in that it is very mechanical and linear. As such it can require effort and so be very emotionally tiring for the Pc. The Six-Direction Process (6-Dir), on the other hand, bypasses a lot of needless efforting on the part of the mind in running incidents, so you get the same benefits without the exhaustion. The arbitrary here is not the Pc's case but the process. 6-Dir is a workhorse process that has no equal. It is what makes it possible for me to run new Pc's on Dianetic auditing effectively and efficiently. Just this morning I got a raw new Pc to run out the last 13 years with regards to her work, which had a lot of misemotional content connected with it. That got done in the span of one hour. I could never have done that without the 6-Dir process. Of course, I always wrap up a segment of time with scanning to make sure it's all flat and nothing else surfaces, which it often does. By the end of the 6-Dir running, the Pc is normally ready to scan such relatively large periods of time.

But what *can* definitely cause the track to temporarily occlude is asking for earlier incidents before the later incident is flattened. Of course flattening each later incident doesn't preclude using somewhat separate incidents as earlier beginnings.

Robert D.

Paul's Independent Academy Presents:

Lock Scanning in R3X

By Robert Ducharme

April 23, 2002

From a post to the R3X thread on
the Freezone America Board:
Posted April 23, 2002.

One way of addressing case is with lock scanning. Some drawbacks to lock scanning, however, include:

1. It is a tedious process, requiring many passes through;
2. It tends to run shallow;
3. Running it can be overwhelming to a heavy case and so cause the track to temporarily occlude.

The positive aspect is that instead of taking one incident at a time as with straight Dianetic auditing, one can handle a whole series of incidents with the same theme.
The way to have the positives in this case, while leaving the negative aspects behind, is to incorporate the 6-Dir process. A typical session incorporating lock scanning might sound like this, where, A = auditor; P= Pc (processee):
Pc's marriage is in trouble and needs to be addressed and scanned out:
A. *How long have you been married?*
P. *12 years.*
A. *Okay, I'd like for you to get the concept of that whole period of time with regards to your marriage.*
P. *Yes, I've done that.*
A. *Good. Now I'd like you to take that segment of time regarding the marriage and put it above you.*
P. *Yes.*
A. *Good. Now put it below you*.
This continues for all six directions, over and over again - above, below, right, left, front, back, above... etc. until a full EP is reached.

A. *Alright. Now move to the beginning of that period of time.*
P. *Yes.*
A. *Good. Move through to the end of that period of time with regard to (or "on the subject of")*

the marriage.
P. *Yes.*
At this point the Pc will often say that the period was blank or clean, at which time that part of the session is ended.
A. *What happened?*
P. *A few things came up...*
At this point the auditor can decide whether to keep scanning (if it's pretty light) or resume the 6-Dir process.

A. *Okay, now I'd like you to take what's left of that segment of time regarding that marriage and put it above you...* (etc.)

This is done until the whole period is flat. Cognitions and changes should abound throughout this procedure. Full EPs should occur. The rules for running narrative R3R apply here except for the inclusion of 6-Dir.

If a lot of the track being run is occluded, you can use the Before/After process a few times to loosen the pictures: *"Spot a moment before the _____ (incident, period of time, series of incidents, etc.)" "Spot a moment after the incident"; "Spot a moment before the incident"* etc.
Various subject tracks of the Pc's can be scanned out like Scn, religion, mother, father, childhood home, individual friends, etc.
The idea is to clean up this lifetime on various subjects.
This is very good especially for people who have a lifetime filled with locks and secondaries, and running individual incidents would be too time consuming. Also, the 6-Dir process is not as tiring as the R3R procedure, and so the Pc does not get drained of energy as quickly as with R3R.

I just had a brand new client today who knows nothing of Scn or clearing tech and I started her out with this method. First I had her do the 6-Dir process on the charged terminals (husband of four years in this case) and then proceeded as stated above.

Robert D.

Paul's Independent Academy Presents:

R3X on a Child

By Robert Ducharme
May 27, 2002

From a post to the R3X thread on
the Freezone America Board:
Posted May 27, 2002.

E-mail feedback from a client:
I got the following e-mail this morning from a client about her nine year old son who has a history of having strong emotional reactions every single time he goes by a particular kindergarten he attended years before. I edited it only for proper names.

[Start of relevant part of e-mail]
P.S. [Child] did want to talk and find out if my process was like his. He says he feels much better and does want to do it again.

P.P.S. I forgot to send this earlier so I get to add one more thing to this. We drove by [name of kindergarten] on the way to the movies and I asked [child] what he thought. He said, about what? That was the point. We were able to drive by the same [name of kindergarten] without him even noticing. I said that was what the process was suppose to do!
[End of E-Mail]

This was his first introduction to clearing tech. His mother was also a new client, though she had started a comm course before.
What I did with him was to have him take the period of time he spent with this school teacher (one school year) and do the 6-Dir process on that to EP, followed by a lock scanning of that period of time with regard to that teacher.
An easier gradient would have been to get the teacher (the main enturbulative terminal) and do an 6-Dir on her to EP, then do the 6-Dir process on the teacher and him together to EP, and then do 6-Dir on the period of time.
As it was, the process took 40 minutes in all. I took the earlier of the two years he spent with her first in this case, so there is a bit more work to be done to completely flatten the subject.

Robert D.

Paul's Independent Academy Presents:

Lifetime Clearing

By Robert Ducharme
April 20, 2003

I've been having a tremendous amount of success with a new pattern of processing. It works for people new to clearing tech as well as people who have been involved in the practice a long time. People seem to really like this and keep coming back for more since they know they are getting permanent wins on areas that are most real to them, and within a relatively short period of time.
I attempt to form a solid auditing base by clearing the person of this lifetime's engrams, secondaries and locks. I run this type of processing until he is relatively flat enough on this lifetime's issues to go on to other styles of processing.

I start by an in-depth assessment of the case.
Then I get which areas of the case are of greatest interest to the Pc and in need of handling.
Then I run them this lifetime with R3R Narrative (commands in example below) and use 6-Dir process in between runs, as needed.
So, if they have an issue with an area in their life, I'll have them get the period of time and have them scan it with R3R Narrative and run 6-Dir.

Here's a typical example of how I will do it:
Auditor: *Which area of your life are you most interested in addressing?*
Pc: *My father.*
Auditor: *Tell me about your relationship with your father.*
Pc: *It was horrible. I have a lot of charge on him. I have all my life too.*
[In other words, a very charged terminal for the Pc]
Auditor: *Okay. So let's run your father, okay?*
Pc: *Okay.*
Auditor: *I'll start with the Six-Direction process on your father, okay?*
[Because the terminal is so charged, I will undercut the scanning by addressing the terminal with 6-Dir first. I will then go on to scanning periods of time acceptable to the Pc, with regards to the terminal. In cases where the terminal is not so charged (like places of work) I will skip the 6-Dir terminal step and scan the period of time regarding the terminal right away.]
Pc: *Alright.*
Auditor: *Okay. Now get the concept of your father* (or 'a' father, in case of several of them if you want him to take them all at once). *Anything that comes to mind as you run this process is fine.*
Pc: *Okay.*
Auditor: *Good, now put it above you...* (etc. 6-Dir to EP.)

Auditor: *Now get a concept of you and your father together.*
Pc: *Okay.*
Auditor: *Good. Now put them above you...* (etc. 6-Dir to EP.)
Auditor: *Now we'll run your past with regards to your father.*
Pc: *Okay.*
[With 2-way communication, auditor determines the length of time and which years are to be handled. It depends on the amount of charge and the Pc's interest. I start with whatever period of time the Pc is most interested in, and go from there.]
Auditor: *Get a concept of that period of time with regards to your father.*
Pc: *Okay.*
Auditor: *Good, now put it above you...* (etc. 6-Dir to EP.)
Auditor: *Move to the beginning of that period of time.*
Pc: *Okay.*
Auditor: *Move through to the end of that period of time with regards to your father.*
Pc: *Done.*
Auditor: *Did anything come up as you were scanning?*
[You want what came up as he was scanning, not 'what happened' in the incidents, which may be flat by now]
Pc: *Yes.*
Auditor: *How charged did it seem?*
Pc: *Not very.*
[At this point the auditor has the choice of reverting back to the 6-Dir process or continuing to have the Pc scan, depending on the severity of the charge. Auditor always ends with a final scan through to make sure that period of time with regards to that subject is completely flat.]
Auditor: *How does that period of time regarding your father seem now?*
Pc: *It's flat.*
[Auditor at this point moves on to the next action. Session is ended per the R3X write-up end of session processes.]

And that's basically how a typical session goes.

The session is tailor made by the auditor for the Pc's individual case before each session, but follows the same general format of addressing periods of time regarding charged terminals with a combination of narrative style Dianetics and the 6-Dir process.

Robert Ducharme

Paul's Independent Academy Presents:

Running Rudiments with R3X

By Robert Ducharme
June 19, 2003

From a post to the R3X thread on
the Freezone America Board:
Posted June 19, 2003.

Running Rudiments with R3X Style Processing

This is a procedure that should have been included in the R3X write-up.

When a Pc starts out a session keyed in by the recent past, instead of running three rudiments (Upset or ARC Break, Present time problem, Missed Withhold, PTP) I simply have the Pc scan the recent past out. Normally that will be the period since the last session.

It's simply running R3R Narrative style with the Six-Direction process between the first set of commands and the last set of commands.

The commands for this are:

1. *Move to the beginning of that period of time. Scan through to the end of that period of time.* (Done once)

2. *Get that period of time and put it above you, below you, right of you, etc.* (Until the process is flat)

3. *Move to the beginning of that period of time. Move through to the end of that period of time.* (Done until flat)

This method works every time, and because of the 6-Dir process, does not run as shallow or hang up on engrams as simple lock scanning might, and does not take an inordinate amount of time to complete.

I don't like to take up single incidents, but I will make exceptions if the situation warrants it.

I don't have anything against the use of the standard rudiments, but when auditing without [the Pc holding the cans], it's better to have a process that doesn't depend on following or indicating reads.

Robert D.

Paul's Independent Academy Presents:

Charged Terminal Rundown

By Robert Ducharme
December 24, 2003

From a post to the R3X thread on
the Freezone America Board:
Posted December 24, 2003.

Scanning Terminals by Four Flows: Charged Terminal Rundown
I've been testing out this process lately with great success.
Scanning used to be a standard procedure in the early '50s and then it was dropped. Why it was dropped is easy to understand. By itself it's a flawed process. It tends to run shallow. Running into engrams can stop the process in its tracks and throw the Pc into an overwhelm. If not run properly it can restimulate areas of life that would be better left undisturbed for the time being.

Yes, I'm familiar with potential shortcomings of lock scanning. They are not anything to be concerned about though, and never come up as a problem in a standardly run R3X session.

The results of scanning terminals by four flows, although nowhere near as spectacular as contacting whole-track Basic-Basic on a chain and running it out, are nevertheless spectacular enough in their own right. I've seen it magically clear up relationships, whether intimate, casual, work, or otherwise. I've never tried, but I suppose it could be run on various dynamics too, but I'd rather wait to do that thoroughly with R3XD.

Procedure
1. The first thing one does do is to determine *which terminal is to be run.* That can be arrived at with 2-way communication or assessment. Usually *parents* are good terminals to start with, with later terminals often being restimulators of the parents.

2. Next the *span of time* to be addressed should be established: the entire lifetime on the subject of the terminal, or just a segment of time. Breaking it down by segments and running it segment by segment, usually from the later segment on the track (closer to present time) to earlier, is the more conservative approach. I limit the use of this technique to only this lifetime. Engram running by chains is still the mainstay technique in my arsenal, but when this lifetime needs to be destimulated, scanning periods of time, whether in general or with particular attention to specific terminals, is my technique of choice.

3. The next thing is to give the Pc an R-factor of *what is expected on flows 2 and 3*. Flows 1 (from another to self) and Flow 0 (from self to self) are self-explanatory. Flows 2 (from another to you) and 3 (from another/others to another/others) can, but do not necessarily, include the terminal being run. In other words, it's a wide open command that allows for anything the File Clerk is willing to present. So if the terminal is "your father", the "another or others" can be anybody, father or otherwise. It is important that the Pc allow the File Clerk to present whatever needs to be viewed. Forcing a particular image or scene into view by the Pc is not part of the process and only detracts from it.

4. Also, make sure the term "With regard to..." is understood by the Pc. It means the same thing as "On the subject of _____" or "With respect to _____", or "Concerning _____" or "As regards _____".

5. The best approach is to first run the *6-Direction Process to EP* on the terminal itself before doing the scanning. If one does this step, it is done right after assessing for which terminal to run. I do this step to reduce the charge on the terminal at the beginning in order to make the scanning easier. Besides, it might key out earlier-similar whole track terminals, so it wouldn't hurt to add this step every time.

Commands on general terminals like "a father" as opposed to "your father" are better since they don't limit the parameters of time. Specific terminals will work, but *general terminals that represent the specific one, are always better*. Sometimes I'll make an exception and use specific terminals though, as with certain co-workers for instance, but that's a judgment call.

Qualifying adjectives like "terrible" or "stupid" or "good" etc. are never used in this process. (References for this can be found in the 1st Melbourne ACC lectures)
So that process would go:
"Get the concept of a father" "Alright"
"Put it above you" "Good"
"Put it below you" "Good"
"Put it to the right of you" "Good"
"Put it to the left of you" "Good"
"Put it in front of you" "Good"
"Put it in back of you" "Good"
etc., etc...

When the person has EP'd on it, he will find that he has to actively put the picture there--that the automatically occurring charged facsimiles will have vanished.

6. Here are the scanning commands:

Move to the beginning of that period of time.

From that point forward to _____, with regard to _____, scan through all the incidents where...

(Flow 1)...*you experienced stress.*
(Flow 2)...*you caused another or others to experience stress.*
(Flow 3)...*others caused others or themselves to experience stress.*
(Flow 0)...*you caused yourself to experience stress.*

This process is done in conjunction with the 6-Direction Process. With few exceptions, I always end off with the scanning command once more to make sure the period of time in question is flat. What the 6-Direction process does, essentially, is to extricate the Pc from identification with the terminal or incident.
If a certain incident shows up that is particularly charged, like a heavy engram or secondary, it is wise to stop and address that single incident until flat, and then return to the more general scanning.
As always, running havingness, at least at the end, is important when running these processes. Also, scanning the session at the end is always a good idea.

Robert D.

Paul's Independent Academy Presents:

Six-Direction Process Shortens Time Spent in Handling Chains

By Robert Ducharme
May 21, 2004

From a post to the R3X thread on the Freezone America Board: May 21, 2004:
[Revised 9/21/04 to update the name of the process to "Above/Below"]. [Revised 12/7/05 to update the name of the process to "Six-Direction", abbreviated to "6-Dir"]

Unburdening a Chain with the 6-Dir Process
More and more I've been applying the 6-Dir process to the chain of incidents run with R3X. If the person is running a dynamic as a chain, I will have him get the terminals related to the chain and run that.

For instance, on the first dynamic, I'll say: *"get the concept of a self"* (or a first-dynamic identity).
It doesn't matter which self the Pc deals with, whether it's his or another's. Whatever the mind presents at the moment is the best thing to use. The concepts can tend to change from command to command, and that's okay too.
Then it's: *"Put it above you" "Good" "Put it below you" "Good", and so on.*
On running terminals one runs the process past F/Ns to the point where no further change occurs - per the Auditor's Code. The latter is very important to getting superior results from this process.

For a chain like "fear", I'll say: *"Get the concept of any and all terminals--people, places, objects, energies, spaces, situations, creatures, etc.--that you associate with fear."*
Then I will give the 6-Dir process commands on that.
Running this process tends to speed up the running of an engram chain. It can be done on the same item on more than one occasion too.

Unburdening the Dynamics with the 6-Dir Process

I think it's good to run the dynamics on the 6-Dir process anyway, regardless of whether one runs R3X on them or not. It's not stable or dramatic like R3X, but it definitely has its benefits. One could go through the dynamics one after the other in succession and then start with the first again on through to the eighth, and continue this until no more charge is had. That would be a quick key-out way of clearing the dynamics, but it would be well worth doing regardless. I've had great success with running "an entity" (7th dynamic) on this process, by the way. It doesn't necessarily replace running the entities' cases should that need come up, but it greatly reduces their overall influence and sets a case up for running the entity case.

For non-Dynamic items, it may be possible to add flows to the process. I haven't worked that out yet so I won't speculate on how the commands would go.

Robert D.

Paul's Independent Academy Presents:

Shock Moment Handling

By Robert Ducharme

April 20, 2003

Sometimes an incident contains a moment of heavy shock that doesn't resolve readily with other processing. It can be handled with this rundown.
The shock moment handling is simple. It's done with Multiple Viewpoint Dianetic Processing as applied to the shock. It's done only after all the other handling on the incident, as previously outlined, has been completed.

1. First the Pc is asked *if there is a moment of shock.* If there is one, then the next steps apply. If there's more than one, the initial one is the most important and should be taken up first (unless unusual circumstances dictate otherwise).

2. The Before/After process:
"Spot a moment before the shock" "Spot a moment after the shock"
done 1,2,1,2.. can be done on the shock in order to open it up and make it more accessible.

3. The *Six-Direction process* can be run on it to lighten the charge.

4. Next the Pc is given the command:
"Move through that moment of shock from beginning to end" repetitive to flat point.

5. The Pc is then asked to *name the relevant other viewpoints* (persons involved) in the incident.

6. The Pc is then asked to assume the viewpoint of the first person and given the command:
"From the viewpoint of ...(person's name)...move through that moment of shock from beginning to end" repetitively until flat.

7. The same is done with *each of the other relevant viewpoints* in the incident (perpetrators, helpers, onlookers, etc.). Some need to be taken singly while others can be grouped together.

8. I then have the Pc take a *pan-determined viewpoint* and run the incident from that perspective.

9. Check if there are any *later shocks that are relevant* and run those too if necessary. Usually

running the initial shock is sufficient.

That is normally enough to take care of any shock in an incident. Shocks persist because of confusion of ownership. The above process is aimed at sorting that out.
Havingness as well as all the other auditing basics still apply.

Robert Ducharme

Paul's Independent Academy Presents:

Lifetime Scanning

By Robert Ducharme
August 8, 2004

From: "Robert D."
Date: Aug 8, 2004.
Subject: Lifetime Scanning

Lifetime Scanning is a process that Combines R3X and Lock Scanning.
Lock scanning is a technique that LRH first wrote about in early 1951 (Volume 1 HCOBs). It has the advantage of being able to sweep across a large segment of time, like years. It was a definite advancement of the tech.
It was discovered to have a few major drawbacks though:
1. It was strictly light processing in that only locks were run with it. Engrams and heavy secondaries did not fare so well with it. They had to be avoided.
2. It tends to run shallow.
3. It can be tedious and time consuming, depending on the Pc's ability to scan.

Lifetime scanning is R3X as applied to large segments of this lifetime, in lock scanning fashion, without the drawbacks that previously plagued lock scanning. With Lifetime Scanning the entire life can be systematically scanned out. I have found the result to be a this-lifetime clearing of the individual. I have found this technique to work well on people whether they have had a lot, little, or no previous processing.

In Lifetime Scanning Technique I like to start out by addressing a period of life that the Pc complains about, usually recent times. I may start out with scanning the past week or month, then run "since the beginning of the year", and then the fairly recent past period of time that might have been turbulent if it warrants special attention. Sometimes the duration of present relationships are good to scan out. This is all a matter for the person wearing the C/S hat to determine.
Lifetime Scanning truly begins with the scanning of the first few years of the person's life. Usually ten year increments are acceptable and workable, but that can be adjusted for the individual.
I like to have the Pc start by scanning without any attention to flows before I run it on flows.

The commands for this procedure are:

Auditor: *"Move to the beginning of that period of time"*
(birth being the beginning of the first segment)
Pc: *"Yes"*
Auditor: *"From that point forward to ten years old, move through to the end of that period of time"*
[auditor can add "and tell me when you're done" if he wishes]

After the Pc goes through the scanning process, the auditor then goes into the Six-Direction process to a release point:
"Get that period of time and put it above you...below you..." etc.
Then the auditor has the Pc *scan through that period of time again.*
These two steps are repeated as needed.

Alternate Approach
It's possible to start the Pc out with the Six-Direction process and then scan afterwards. If the time period is very heavily charged and the auditor thinks the Pc will have a rough time scanning the first time, that can be done.

Running Into Charged Areas
When the Pc runs into a charged area that stops him from scanning further, the auditor can temporarily change direction and run the Pc on R3X on that single incident until it's flat, and afterwards resume the lifetime scanning.
This procedure can be continued until the entire lifetime is flat.
Then one starts all over again by running the periods of time 4 flows. That is done using the following commands:

Auditor: *"Move to the beginning of that period of time"*
Pc: *"Yes"*
(Flow 1)
Auditor: *"From that point forward to ten years old, scan through all the incidents where you experienced stress"*
(Flow 2)
Auditor: *"From that point forward to ten years old, scan through all the incidents where you caused another or others to experience stress"*
(Flow 3)
Auditor: *"From that point forward to ten years old, scan through all the incidents where others caused others or themselves to experience stress"*
(Flow 0)
Auditor: *"From that point forward to ten years old, scan through all the incidents where you*

caused yourself to experience stress"

This is followed up the same way as the previous run-through with no flows. The only difference is that the auditor should say "Get that series of incidents..." instead of "get that period of time". A minor point, but it's meant to minimize any possible confusion for the Pc. The commands above are the ones I prefer to use. If the auditor feels more comfortable using the flow commands that are more close to R3R, that will work too.
Running Lifetime Scanning this way, general scanning first and then running the four flows afterwards, is a gradient approach. The auditor can also go straight into running the four flows right away if it's warranted.
I use the button "stress" because it encompasses anything that involves resistance - which is the basic makeup of the bank.

Robert D.

Paul's Independent Academy Presents:

R3X Procedure

by Robert Ducharme

April 20, 2003

Revised December 10, 2005

Revision of 12/10/05 is to delete two points (what was 32 and 33), per a 12/09/05 post from Robert, saying they were not really needed.

Minimum Pre-Requisites: Book 1 Auditor Course plus NED or HSDC (including the TRs Course and Student Hat Course). The auditor ideally should be a Clear and Class 4 or above. He should know the Auditor's Code cold and apply it.

Recommended Reading Material and References

R3RA procedure bulletins; "Dianetics Today"; "Tech Dictionary"; "A History of Man"; Whole-Track tapes; Dianetic tape series by LRH; Tape: "The Goals Problem Mass", 6112C31 CHC-4, 31 Dec. 1961; "Engram Running by Chains", bulletins 1, 2., and 3 of 15 May 63, 8 June 63, and 24 June 63.

Note: The commands given here, prior to the Shift handling, vary only slightly from the original R3R commands. The original commands can be found in Dianetics Today and the Tech Volumes. The exact wording of the commands are not as important as consistency where it's needed and being real and flexible where that's needed. Roteness is a handicap and liability. The auditor is expected to use good judgment in any case.

Caveat

The approach I have taken is from my own research and experience and is not necessarily in agreement with what is referred to as the "standard bridge" though it does qualify as "standard tech" per the definition. I don't pretend that the tech as written here is the last word in tech advancement and that it can't be improved, but it does work in achieving a finite goal, namely that of getting the Pc to take full responsibility for the item run along all dynamics. I know of no other technique that will accomplish this. Obviously not every Pc is ready for this step and his or her case must be set up with such things as "standard bridge" processing. In fact, the more set-up processing a Pc gets, the more smoothly and efficiently R3X seems to run.

It is recommended that one learns R3R as taught in Dianetics first so as to have a primary foundation as a standard by which this tech can be compared.

Procedure

1. Two *way comm with Pc* (or do a formal assessment) to establish which item is to be run. Get the wording that most exactly fits the feeling.

2. Give first command: *"Locate an incident where you had the feeling of (item)."*

3. When the Pc has located the incident, give the question: *"When was it?"*

4. Next give the command: *"Move to that incident."*

5. Ask: *"What is the duration of that incident?"*

6. Give command: *"Move to a point just before that began."*
The purpose of this is to make sure the person doesn't miss the original shock of the incident. This should be at a point where he was still feeling relatively normal or "like himself". The auditor can add the standard *"...and tell me when you are there"* if he so chooses.

7. Ask (if appropriate): *"What do you see?"*
I will often omit this step when I know the processee is doing well and the duration is only a few minutes. The problem with a short duration comes when he tells you all about the incident before you run him through it, so you're not sure whether to give the "Move through..." command or not. But it's no big deal either way. I normally skip this command except for whole track incidents.

8. Give command: *"Move through to the end of that incident."*
I don't include the usual "Move through the incident to a point ... later" because I prefer to leave it up to the Pc to decide what the end of the incident is as he's running it.

9. If the Pc says something during this time, this is acknowledged with: *"Okay, continue."*

10. Ask: *"What happened?"*
This question can be phrased in several ways, like "What occurred?", "What did you get?", "What did you notice as you went through?", "What came up?", etc. I use whatever happens to seem most appropriate at the moment. As an auditor, the first time through I am interested in what actually took place, so I ask "What happened?" to elicit that response. However, after the first time through, I am more interested in what the Pc saw newly as he was scanning than the story line, so I'll tend to vary the question to elicit that type of response.

11. Give command: *"Move to the beginning of that incident."*
(Still before the beginning, but I go with that command. The Pc knows where to start from).

12. Give command: *"Move through to the end of that incident."*

13. Ask: *"What happened?"*

14. Ask (when appropriate): *"How does the incident seem now (by comparison) (with the last time through)?"*
This is more of a two-way-comm question than a rote one. You might need to add something like "Is it lighter or flat?". Other terms besides "lighter" include: less charged, erasing, less serious, better, etc. Asking "Is it erasing or going more solid?" is geared toward moving the Pc on to another incident after a couple of passes through. The theory that command operates on is that the incident will not erase if the charge comes from an earlier incident.

In fact, each incident can be discharged--as long as the entire incident is being viewed (including earlier beginning and later ending, and should be. To not do so can cause the Pc's attention to remain fixed on the later incident when handling earlier incidents, thus leading to shallow running and/or a blocked earlier track. *So each incident along the way should be run to its own EP as though it were a narrative incident as in the R-3R tech.*

Note: Sometimes running other viewpoints is necessary if the incident is particularly charged. Sometimes, though rarely, one needs to run the shock out of the incident too. (See p.37: "Shock Moment Handling") Generally I try to flatten the incident the regular ways first, and if a shock moment keeps it from resolving by any other means, I may incorporate the other- and pan-determined viewpoints in shock handling. I try to reserve shock or Shift handling for basic on the chain whenever possible. When dealing with Clear Pcs, this should not be a problem.

Moving on to the Next Incident
If after asking "How does the incident seem now by comparison?", the Pc says "flat" or "released", then it's okay to ask the "earlier incident" question.
If the Pc's attention goes to another incident, then that one should be taken up if the Pc feels ready to move on to it. Usually that's the case.
One should never run an earlier incident unless the later incident is either flat or the Pc's attention is drawn to an earlier one. Even in the latter case, the earlier incident may act as an earlier beginning, so when in doubt it is prudent to ask if the later incident is okay to leave behind or if it should be run as a later ending to the earlier incident. In any case it's still good to make sure the later incident is flat.

15. When the incident being run is flat or the Pc is ready to move on to another incident, ask: *"Is there another (or "an earlier") incident where you had the feeling of (item)?"*
If another incident comes in to view first, then omit the above command.

16. Then ask: *"When was it?"*

Normally I use "another" for MEST universe incidents and "an earlier" for pre-MEST universe incidents. I have no fixed rule on this though. It's a judgment call. I get the best results by giving the "another" command and just letting the Pc handle whatever pictures or incidents the command triggers regardless of time sequence. Sometimes an earlier incident will be more prominent and get the Pc's first attention, then a later one may come to mind after the earlier has been handled. The Pc finds the incidents in the order that is real to his case. A Pc may find dozens and dozens of incidents from this lifetime--and in no particular order--before even going back to earlier lives. It's not time badly spent, and it's on the correct gradient for the Pc.

If the Pc gets a group of incidents together, I will ask him for the time period that covers, and fashion the commands around that factor. For instance: "Move to the beginning of that series of incidents (or "...that period of time"); "Move through to the end of that series of incidents (or "... that period of time") instead of the usual commands. Good TRs and auditor presence keeps the Pc from wandering from the area being addressed. That is not to say that lock scanning this lifetime prematurely is advisable. It's better to take the incidents as the Pc hands them. If the Pc hands a group of them at once, I'll run it that way.
In addition, I will normally use the Six-Direction process after the first scan through and until flat and then have the Pc scan once more.
In scanning, I will use the term "series of incidents" for any specialized grouping of incidents, and use the term "period of time" for that period of time in general. So the commands "Scan through to the end of that series of incidents" is used when the auditor wants to make sure to limit which incidents the Pc scans. Being this specific may or may not be an absolute necessity, but it is a cautious move to reduce the possibility of misunderstanding by the Pc.
Once you have an answer to 16. "When was it?" you go to 17:

17. Give command: *"Move to that incident"*

Repeat previously outlined steps from the "What is the duration of that incident?" question on forward.
Keep tracking back incidents until nothing earlier shows up.

In the case of grinding and/or otherwise suspecting an earlier beginning to the incident to exist, one asks something like *"Is there an earlier beginning to this incident?"* or "Does this incident have an earlier beginning?" (One could also similarly look for a later ending.) Once one gets the earlier beginning, it's good to ask "*What do you see?"* The thing to look for is a point in time before the incident and its main somatic began, a time when the Pc was feeling relatively well or neutral.

In running this process, when an incident goes flat, the Pc is always asked for another (or earlier) incident regardless of how much the current incident may appear to be a basic.

Running Pre-MEST Incidents
The basic incident on the chain is never a MEST universe incident. It is always pre-MEST. The auditor ultimately aims for pre-MEST incidents if at all possible.
All chains are basically flow zero. Running the Shift will help the Pc to determine that with certainty along all his dynamics.
If the Pc is unable to get an earlier incident with the "earlier incident" command, he is asked:
"Is there an earlier incident, possibly before the beginning of time..."
(or "...in the Theta universe...?"--whatever phrasing indicates) "*...where you had the feeling of ... (item)...?"*

Thereafter the "another incident" or "earlier incident" command is given until there are no more. To ask for time or duration when dealing with pre-MEST incidents will often get a confused response from the Pc, since time as we know it didn't exist then, which is why I have dropped those steps. Then the question is asked:
"Is there an earlier incident, possibly around the original separation from Static, where you had the feeling of ...(item)...?"

The question can be posed in various ways like "...break-off from Static", "...breakaway from Source", "separation from self", etc.
The question will either indicate or not. If the question elicits an instant read, one can steer the Pc to the incident. The Pc should know beforehand that pre-MEST incidents are very ethereal and conceptual rather than physical and concrete in nature and so can be very subtle and elusive. Basic on any chain may or may not be the original separation from Static, but it usually is. Regardless, the Pc should run the incident presented by the File Clerk when prompted and not skip to a basic prematurely.

Pre-MEST incidents are run as follows:
Note: The "When was it?" command is omitted after entry is made into the pre-MEST area, i.e. when looking for earlier similar pre-MEST incidents. If the auditor chooses to ask for duration and the Pc appears bewildered by the question, then it would be best to let that step go as time in that case would have little meaning to the him.
17. (Same as above) "Move to that incident" (the "duration" question is omitted since time in that era is irrelevant).

18. *"Move to a point just before that began"*
(the rest of the procedure is the same as previously outlined)

Alternate Confront Process and Other Remedies
If after running Basic-Basic on the chain to a "flat point" with nothing earlier on the chain, the Pc is still having some unreality problems with regards to the incident, the auditor can run *"What part of that incident could you confront?"* and *"What part of that incident would you rather not confront?"* back and forth to a release point (accompanied by BD F/N; usually no more than a few commands.) Two other processes that can be run on the basic incident are the Before/After process and the Six-Direction process.
Running the Shift should resolve the balance of the unreality. (see p. 67 section: "Through the 'No Earlier Incident' Block".)

Handling the Moment of Shift
(See p. 65, section: "The Shift" and "Shock or Shift?")
The Shift as outlined here should only be used on pre-MEST universe basic incidents, and preferably on Basic-Basic. The Shift basically addresses the viewpoints' various dynamics, the basic goals associated with the item addressed, and any computations.

19. Ask Pc for the moment of Shift. The auditor can ask if the Shift was:
"From what to what?", in other words, "What were things like before versus what were things like afterwards?"

20. At this point I always run the **Before/After process:**
"Spot a moment before the Shift" and "Spot a moment after the Shift" repetitively to flat point. This is normally a very short action usually consisting of only about two, three or four commands.

21. I have also often been running the **6-Dir process on the Shift:**
"Get a concept of the Shift, put it above you, put it below you, put it to the right of you, put it to the left of you, put it in front of you, put it in back of you, put it above you..." etc. Done repetitively to flat point.
This can be a valuable action which tends to open up new data about the Shift for the Pc. It also clears more charge from the Shift and makes running it an easier task. I have been employing this action more and more of late. One can use the 6-Dir process on the Shift with benefit even after having previously run the incident itself.

22. Give command: *"Move through that moment of Shift from beginning to end."* (Repeat until flat.)
This and the other similar commands work regardless of the "timelessness" of the Shift. The Pc can easily "inject time" into it to make it viewable. I toyed with the idea of incorporating the command "Spot the Shift" as a repetitive command. That did work, however one person commented that that wording didn't give her as clear and expanded a view of the Shift as the original one did.

23. Ask Pc how he felt after the Shift. Note down his responses for later reference. Then have Pc assume that viewpoint. Then give command:
"From the viewpoint you had after the Shift, move through that moment of Shift from beginning to end." (Repeat to flat point)
Note: The above command has been placed before any "others" viewpoint (25-28) in the sequence.

24. Ask Pc how he felt before the Shift. Then have Pc assume that viewpoint. Then give command:
"From the viewpoint you had before the Shift, move through that moment of Shift from beginning to end." (Repeat to flat point.)
I've found the order of the last two commands to be most workable, but that doesn't preclude the Pc doing better at running them vice-versa if the later viewpoint is too unconfrontable.
The idea behind these two commands is to get the Pc to confront the moment of Shift from both points of view--from the point of view of his original and expansive identity, and from the point of view of his new and limited identity. The commands may appear to defy logic, but they run quite as well as all the other commands. The process could be viewed as a contact assist done on the Shift from each point of view.

Note: Some of the following commands may seem daunting or abstract and hard to comprehend, but they run quite well on everyone.

25. Ask Pc to *"Spot all other individual beings (or viewpoints) extant at the time of the Shift".* There always are after the Shift regardless of how "single" or "unified" the Pc may have conceived himself to be before the Shift. (See Ref.: The Factors by LRH from Scientology 8-8008 and Scientology 0-8)

26. Have the Pc assume the viewpoints of all the others collectively. Then give command:
"From the viewpoints of all the others, move through that moment of Shift from beginning to end." (Repeat until flat.)

27. Ask Pc if there are any other relevant terminals involved in the Shift moment. For each viewpoint to be run, if such still exists, ask Pc to take that viewpoint first. Then run with command:
"From the viewpoint of _____ move through that moment of Shift from beginning to end." (Repeat to flat point).
He may choose to run the other participants as a group. If so, just have him take their viewpoint as a group. Usually this extra step will be unnecessary as all viewpoints will have been handled in the previous step.

28. Have Pc *take the viewpoints of all the others in the incident* again. Then have him *scan all of their time tracks*. If he has any problem with this, have him assume he can do this and then have him carry out the command. The command isn't rote, but a command like:
"Scan through all of the others' time tracks" will do. Done to flat point.
This step may seem daunting at first, but, amazingly enough, I have found everyone so far capable of carrying it out.

29. Ask Pc about *any creations (masses, energy, space, particles, etc.), anything that came into being after the Shift.* Have Pc assume the viewpoint of these creations. Then give the command: *"From that viewpoint, move through that moment of Shift from beginning to end."* (Repeat until flat)

30. Next have Pc *take the viewpoint of the creations* again. Then have him *scan all of their time tracks.* The above viewpoint is comparable to the 6th dynamic and seems to run quite easily once the Pc understands what is expected of him. Scanning the tracks is an optional step which I have added because it seems to work on everyone, and because people report benefits from doing so. The auditor can tell the Pc to just assume that he can do it.

31. Tell Pc *"next we'll take up a pan-determined viewpoint."*
Be sure the Pc has a good reality on what is expected of him. Have Pc assume a pan-determined viewpoint. Then give command:
"From a pan-determined viewpoint, experience that moment of Shift from beginning to end" (Repeat to flat point)
This viewpoint encompasses all those taken so far, from an independent point of view. Another way of stating it is "All viewpoints at once". I use "experience" instead of "move through" just to be precise in my words. I surmise that a higher viewpoint would be more widely encompassing of the incident with regards to time/space. Both versions probably work equally well however. I just chose to do it this way when running the higher (more widely encompassing) viewpoints as a result of taking a cue from Rowland Barkley's Multiple Viewpoint Dianetic processing.

32. Tell Pc *"Next we'll take up the viewpoint of being."* Give the command:
"From the viewpoint of just being, experience that moment of Shift from beginning to end." (Repeat to flat point).
This command can be given with the clarification that the person should interpret it in whatever way he chooses (like "Whatever that means to you"). The command does impinge on the being and gets a valid response. I first encountered this from one Pc who told me that she could see a higher viewpoint than "pan-determined". I found that it worked on everyone and have been incorporating it ever since. Pcs seem all to be able to make it run, as well as be able to determine

whether it's flat or not. I personally interpret it as "individual godhood".

33. Tell Pc *"Next we'll take up the viewpoint of All-Being"*
(variously known as "The All-That-Is, Infinite Being, Universal Consciousness," etc.) In this context, "All-being" can be variously translated as "allness", "the whole", "all that is", "infinite being". Whichever term indicates best should be used. Since "God" is a debatable concept that has little common agreement as to definition, I've avoided that term. I've tried "the universe", but that didn't seem to run very well as it tended to be taken as MEST.
Give the command:
"From the viewpoint of infinite being (or "all-being") experience that moment of Shift from beginning to end." (Repeat to flat point).

34. Tell Pc *"Next we'll take up the viewpoint of Source (Source of all being or all consciousness)".* Give the command:
"From the viewpoint of Source, experience that moment of Shift from beginning to end." (Repeat to flat point).

35. Tell Pc *"Next we'll take up the viewpoint of Static".* Give the command:
"As Static experience that moment of Shift from beginning to end." (Repeat to flat point).

36. Lastly, give the command:
"As Static experience that moment of Shift backwards from the end to the beginning." (Repeat to flat point).

Running all these additional viewpoints may at first seem a bit like overdoing it, but every one of these viewpoints runs and blows charge, and they form a fairly smooth gradient toward the Pc taking full responsibility from the very highest, most expansive level regarding the subject at hand. After trying them out on a few Pcs, the auditor will find out for himself how workable the commands are.

37. Ask Pc: *"In or around that moment of Shift is there any other feeling or emotion?"*
(Handle feelings with repeater technique. Repeat question. Continue until clean.) (See p. 68, section: "Handling of Feelings".)

These questions are simply buttons to check for any thoughts, emotions, or efforts that might still be contained in the Shift. Other possible buttons include: thoughts, ideas, considerations, postulates, intentions.

38. Ask Pc about *any feelings or postulates he may have mentioned earlier in running this incident.* Run them out with *repeater technique* as necessary. (Handle feelings with repeater

technique. Repeat question. Continue until clean.)

When the chain is properly run to its Basic-Basic and all the viewpoints run, these questions will rarely be necessary. Such questions are usually clean by the time all the viewpoints have been run.

39. Ask Pc: *"In or around that moment of Shift is there any goal?"*
There are always at least two opposing goals in or around the Shift. Normally two goals are all I find. They should have some bearing on the item being run.

40. The next step is to find some sort of computation. The following suggestion by Revenius has been very workable in practice: "A ser fac is a solution. You could just ask for what postulate enabled him to still be right or various wordings--it's what solved and explains the overwhelm of the incident so as not to need further inspection." -- Revenius

A computation generally says "If (since, because, etc.)... then (therefore, thereafter, etc.)..." or any variation thereof. Examples are "If I behave this particular (aberrated) way, I'll be liked"; "You can't count on others because they'll always betray you"; "Because they did that to me, I can annihilate them."
It could be viewed as a "justified postulate".
One approach to finding a computation would be to ask for a fixed idea in or around the Shift, and then ask for how that might have been justified.
If a computation can't be found any other way, you could always ask:
"Is there any parallel between this incident and the events of this lifetime?" After the Pc itsas on that and makes the connection, *ask him if he can find a pro-survival computation that has made this item appear useful to him.* There is usually one, but there could always be more than one. It will be a computation he has been basing actions on this whole lifetime.

Have Pc repeat the computation until it goes flat (releases). A computation is normally an equation that amounts to "If I have X aberration in a Y situation, then that will solve my problem." So it basically says: "Unwanted situation plus compulsive postulate equals solution". The computation is only an apparent solution which in actuality only compounds the problem for the user and makes it persist.
Normally simply looking for a justified postulate somewhere around the Shift moment works. A lot of times the Pc will make these statements as he itsas during the running of the Shift.

<u>Rule:</u> Everything that Sounds Like a Computation, Postulate or Goal Must Be Written Down by the Auditor for Reference Later in the Session.

The auditor can then refer back to these phrases for two way comm and run them out by repeater

technique if they are the least bit charged.

For any postulate being run, always look for an opposing postulate to run along with it, no matter from what corner it may appear to be coming. Computations are normally run as single statements.

41. Run this process alternately/repetitively:
"What part of that incident could you be responsible for?"
and *"What part of that incident would you rather not be responsible for?"*
This is done 1,2,1,2,1,2 etc. to EP.
If the person answers "All of it" to the first question, then I will pose the second question as "Is there any part of that incident you would rather not be responsible for?" They will normally say no to that, followed by a BD F/N.

42. Give the commands for four flows of scanning. Repeat as necessary to flat point.
F1*: "From this incident forward to present time, scan through all the incidents where you had the feeling of (item)."*
F2*: "From this incident forward to present time, scan through all the incidents where you caused another or others to have the feeling of (item)."*
F3: *"From this incident forward to present time, scan through all the incidents where others caused others or themselves to have the feeling of (item)."*
F0:*" From this incident forward to present time scan through all the incidents where you caused yourself to have the feeling of (item)."*

This action usually takes only one or two times through to F/N, but sometimes (though rarely) a bit more. After the basic on flow 0 is erased, everything stemming from there blows like minor locks. This is the same procedure as was written about in Book 1 auditing on a single flow except that it's taken wholesale instead of one incident at a time.

If there are any problems in running these, one can always employ the 6-Dir process on that segment of time, or on a mass that happens to be stirred up.

43. Ask Pc *"How the item seems now?"*.

End-of-Session Processes
44. Scanning the session. Give the commands:
"Move to the beginning of this session" and *"Move through to the end of this session."* Repeat to flat point as needed.
This step was suggested by LRH in several places where he said that one should as-is an

incident, and then as-is the fact of having as-ised it. It's also a safeguard against unflat areas of the session which should show up on running this step if they exist.

Havingness
I will usually run two havingness processes--one aimed at replenishing the mental mass, and another aimed at reorientation to the present time environment. Each is done to F/N. This is a fairly brief step. If the Pc balks at running havingness, let him know that it's not so much for the being as for the body and G.E. to keep it from pulling in unwanted feelings.
Note: Havingness is something needed and wanted by some and not by others. If the Pc opts for no havingness, a watchful eye should be kept on him for signs of low havingness, and remedy accordingly. This process is notorious for removing large masses from the case. Personally I would remedy havingness as long as the Pc didn't protest or feel invalidated by it.

45. For Havingness, nowadays I say: "Put out eight anchor points"
(Pc can use objects for anchor points if he chooses) (Pc acks but auditor doesn't)
now "Push them into the body"
(auditor ack) *"Put out eight anchor points." "Now allow them to remain where they are."*
(auditor ack) *"Put out eight anchor points." "Now throw them away."*
(auditor ack) *"Put out eight anchor points" "Now do whichever you want with them."*
The last command is repeated to a release point. Usually around 5 to 10 commands suffices.

For beginners, and some Pcs who prefer it, instead of "Put out eight anchor points" I will use the command instead: "Create (or "mock up") a pleasant scene" or else "Mock up an acceptable object" (the more large and massive the better). Auditor (per LRH data) should not acknowledge the Pc on this step as it may tend to as-is the mockup.

Then I say "Spot an object" or else "Look at that (object pointed to)" done to a release point.

46. An effective present-time orientation process one could use is: "Look around and tell me something you could have". Different people respond differently to various havingness processes. Some do well on some, others do better on others. The trick is to find the havingness processes best suited to the individual Pc.

47. Give command *"End of session."*
The EP of this procedure is primarily "Full responsibility for the item on all dynamics", and secondarily, "Item completely erased" (I would add "forever", but that would be too presumptive of the Pc's will) and "Able to mock up the item if one would choose to". This is normally accompanied by a sense of expanded space and a feeling of added freedom and well-being.

Sometimes it takes a few days or a few weeks before the person adjusts fully to the change from

the process. He may have ongoing cognitions for quite some time, even months later, even after only one session. So how the sessions are spaced out is dependent on the Pc's ability to assimilate change. Too many sessions in too short a period of time can result in overlapping cognitions. The person will be experiencing cognitions and changes from two, three, four or more sessions, all at one time. So it's best to space out the frequency of sessions accordingly. One completed chain per week is standard.

Robert Ducharme

Paul's Independent Academy Presents:

Special Attention Process

By Robert Ducharme

August 26, 2004
Revised May 24, 2007

The Special Attention process is used whenever the Pc has encountered an area of track that is particularly charged and occluded. One would use this process on heavy engrams, implant incidents, GPMs, or any incidents that are unusually charged. Normally, this-lifetime incidents are not charged enough to need this process.
This process makes use of the thought-emotion-effort scale, effort being the one most readily perceived by the Pc and therefore the first one of the three buttons used.
Even before effort, however, comes occlusion. So the first command is aimed at the blank area of the track.
After thought has been handled, there may still be comm lines extant. These are handled with the comm line command. Sometimes this command indicates, sometimes not, but it comes up often enough that it's still worth a try.
The purpose of this process is to penetrate through the occlusions of heavily charged areas. It works quite well in doing this.
The commands may seem numerous, but they do work, and the Pc can quickly adjust to them.
The process is run only after the incident has been flattened with the usual R3X commands.
The commands for this process are as follows:

Note: Each command starts with "Move to the beginning of the incident". Also, each command should be cleared with the Pc in advance. The commands do seem lengthy, but Pcs get used to them very quickly and the mind has no problem assimilating their meaning.

Occluded Command
"Move to the beginning of the incident."
"With particular attention to anything hidden, suppressed, overwhelming, invisible or occluded, or has (contains) unconsciousness, move through to the end of the incident (or series of incidents)."

Effort Command
"Move to the beginning of the incident."
"With particular attention to any force, energies, masses, resistance, efforts, pressure, impact, barriers, (violence, drugs - if applicable), move through to the end of the incident (or series of incidents)."

Emotion Command
"Move to the beginning of the incident."
"*With particular attention to any emotions, feelings or reactions, pains, sensations, attitudes, protest, move through to the end of the incident (or series of incidents)."*

Thought Command
"Move to the beginning of the incident."
"With particular attention to any thoughts, fixed ideas, decisions, postulates, implanted commands, beliefs, agreements, move through to the end of the incident (or series of incidents)."

Shock Moment
"Move to the beginning of the incident."
"With particular attention to any shock moment that might be there, move through to the end of the incident."

Run *6-Direction process* till flat.
One can use Before/After process to open it up more, if needed.
One can run through 6-Dir process first if needed.

Then:
Ask Pc to name the *other relevant viewpoints* (or persons involved) in the incident. They can be grouped as "allies", "helpers", "perpetrators" etc. and *run collectively as such.*

Be sure to have the Pc assume the relevant viewpoint(s) before he runs it.
Any viewpoint that does not go flat quickly can be aided with the 6-Direction process from that viewpoint.

Important: If a shock moment came up during the incident and goes "flat", it should be run as a shock moment handling anyway, even after.

First command is *"Move through that moment of shock from beginning to end"* repetitively till flat.

Then:
"From the viewpoint of____ move through that moment of shock from beginning to end".
Repetitively until flat.

Repeat this with each of the other viewpoints in the incident.

Plus, include the viewpoint of the body and its genetic entity (or Life Force) (all at the same time). This step is done when relevant. If the Pc had no body in the incident, then obviously it would not be relevant.

Then:
run the Pan-Determined viewpoint (the viewpoint senior to and encompassing all other viewpoints there):
"From a Pan-Determined viewpoint move through that moment of shock from beginning to end."

Comm Line Command
"Move to the beginning of the incident"
"With particular attention to any comm (or communication) lines move through to the end of the incident."

Then:
"Is there any part of this incident that is still connected to you in present time?"

These commands are not fixed in stone, and can be varied according to need. For instance, with the "effort" command, one could include "violence" or "flows" if deemed appropriate. But a balance has to be struck between being too extensive and too brief with the commands.

The Special Attention commands are run in the same way as the (general) R3X commands. One runs the command once through, then runs the 6-Dir process until flat, then runs the Special Attention command once again. One does this until that Special Attention command is flat. One then proceeds on to the next command, etc.

Robert D.

Paul's Independent Academy Presents:

Handling Entities

By Robert Ducharme
September 7, 2006

Editor's Note: There are no real details from OT3 or NOTs or other upper-level materials here, but some might consider anything involving entities dangerous in some way. Well, big deal, it's too late, you've now read the word. Still breathing? Then the worst is over and you might as well read the rest. Robert labeled this article "Confidential" and put a warning at the beginning. I edited out his label and warning for this checksheet. My reasoning is that Pcs may originate about entities at any case level, not only when they are OT3, and to be in the position of not being able to handle such a situation when there is no real danger in doing so is unprofessional as well as ridiculous.

From a post to Yahoo Group:
DianeticR3X, Sept. 7, 2006.

In handling cases with R3X, one occasionally runs across an entity in the Pc's present time space. Even though I disagree with the need to address entities as a matter of course, one does occasionally crop up in auditing and needs to be summarily dispatched. There is a lot more tech regarding entities in the NOTs material and the Captain Bill bridge, but the following steps are all that I have been employing.

1. First thing to do is to *2way comm with the Pc to find out if the entity is in present time or from the incident.* If the entity came up as a result of an incident being run, the incident must be thoroughly flattened first, using the Special Attention commands if necessary. Entities will usually blow by simply running the incident. I try to avoid addressing entities as I prefer to not validate the Pc's entity case. Entities are only there because of common charge. Better to dispatch the entity by running out the Pc's charge than by addressing the entity itself. LRH's rule on this is the same as mine. In the book *A History of Man* Chapter 10 he said: "We aren't much interested in auditing entities except when auditing one can reduce rapidly a physical somatic or physical ill."

2. *Make sure that the Pc is hatted on how to address an entity,* i.e. to focus directly on it, to maintain a neutral attitude, and to acknowledge after each command carried out by the entity. In other words, the entity should be treated as would any Pc.

3. Get the Pc to get in contact with the being, i.e. *locate the entity in space/time.*

4. If need be, have the Pc run the "Hello and Okay" process on the entity. Hello and Okay process said to the Pc:
"Say hello to the entity."
"Have the entity say okay to that hello."
"Have the entity say hello to you."
"Say okay to that hello."
Done until the Pc knows he's in good comm with the entity.

5. Have the Pc ask the entity *"What are you?"*. This means essentially "What game are you playing?" or "What role are you playing in that game?" (like "playing the game of tormentor", or being "a tormentor").

6. Have the Pc ask the entity *"What incident are you stuck in?"*. This is a question that LRH suggested in one of the early 1950s lectures, and borrowed by the Capt. Bill bridge. This step may have to be carried out more than once depending on how ready the entity is to receive it.

If the entity balks at answering, the question may be repeated until it is answered.

If the entity still ignores the command, as a last resort, have the Pc assume the viewpoint of the All-That-Is (the Supreme Being, God, Infinite Being, the 8th Dynamic, etc.). Then give the command "From the viewpoint of the All-That-Is, ask the entity "What incident are you stuck in?" I've never known this to fail. If done right, the entity, no matter of what perceived stature, has no choice but to answer.

7. Tell the Pc to give the entity the command to *"Move to that incident."*

8. Tell the Pc to ask the entity the question *"What are you aware of there?"* or "What's there (at the beginning)?". If it's a point of turmoil or violence, tell the Pc to ask the entity if there is an earlier beginning he can find, until he finds a point where he felt peaceful and like himself. Then have the Pc give the command to "Move through to the end of the incident (or series of incidents if applicable)".

These commands are repeated as many times as necessary to run out the incident.

9. The *6-Direction process may be used* as an adjunct in order to speed things up if it's particularly charged. The patter for this would be *"Have the entity put the incident above him, below, right, left, front, back, above, ...(etc.)"* No need to ack the Pc on each of these commands.

10. Always have the Pc run the entity through the incident one last time to *make sure the incident is flat.*

Rarely, the entity will have an earlier similar or another incident to run. If so, then go through the same procedure again. This rarely happens, so I wouldn't anticipate it occurring.

11. When the entity is finally doing well and is free, you can have the client read him his rights by repeating these lines to him:
"You have the right to your own sanity and self determinism."
"You have the right to play or leave the game."
"We are not holding you, no one can."
"If you wish you can stay and help us clean up this game."
This step is not a necessity, but it is useful and is, at least in essence if not word for word, part of the Capt. Bill bridge.

12. Have the Pc give the entity the command *"Point to the being you individuated from".* I'm not sure where this command originated, but it is included in The Pilot's materials. It has been very effective so far. By this time the entity should be free.

Special Circumstances

13. If the entity was involved with a base or a space ship or machinery or any MEST like that, have the Pc get the entity to *run 6-Directions on all the MEST involved.* This is done right after the entity is finished running the incident it's stuck in.

At the end of a session with an entity in this situation, I'll have the Pc mock up some positive energy in the spot where the MEST was, in an effort to fill the vacuum.

This procedure has worked every time for me and has never failed me.

Robert D.

Paul's Independent Academy Presents:

Additional Step for Shock Moment Handling

By Robert Ducharme

December 18, 2006

From a post to Yahoo Group:
DianeticR3X, Dec. 18, 2006.

When using the special attention buttons on heavy early track incidents like implants that contain a lot of force, it's a good idea, after running all the buttons (hidden, effort, emotion, thought, comm lines) to ask if there is still a moment of shock in the incident. If there is, it needs to be run out too. One occasionally runs into this situation. The operating stable datum here is to drain *all* of the charge available from such an incident. If the Pc says the shock moment is still charged, then the auditor should take that at face value and proceed to handle the moment of shock.

Going from handling the incident in general, to applying the special attention buttons, to addressing the moment of shock is like going from a magnifying glass to an optical microscope to a scanning electron microscope. Just when you thought you'd seen the last of it, a whole new vista unfolds. That's the way it is with incident running. *You run the incident in one style until it's "flat", and then you shift styles and find a whole new area of heretofore undetected charge.* You never go on to the next step until the previous one is "flat".

How do you run a shock moment? I don't bother with the full Shift handling for a later-than-basic-on-the-chain incident. Instead I opt for a brief (though still thorough) handling. It's amazing how much charge can be still left in the moment of shock when the whole incident is already "flat" and run from so many angles. So one has to be prepared for a tough slug if it should occur, with the use of Before and After, Alternate Confront, and 6-Directions just on the moment of shock and repeater technique, as needed. Thoroughness is of as much importance here as elsewhere in running R3X. The basic command for the moment of shock are:

"Move through that moment of shock from beginning to end."

This is done in three steps:
1. from the Pc's own perspective, repeatedly until flat, where the above command is used as written.

2. from each of any relevant viewpoints (perpetrator, other victims, etc.) with the command being *"from the viewpoint of ... (terminal)... move through that moment of shock from beginning to end"*, repeatedly until flat.

3. from a pan-determined viewpoint. The command here is *"from a pan- determined viewpoint move through that moment of shock from beginning to end"*, repeatedly until flat.

The reference for the moment of shock can be found in HCOB 17 April 1956, also issued as PAB No. 80 which says:

"**More important** than pain and unconsciousness. That added bit can be briefly stated as "the moment of shock." "The moment of shock" is that period of realization by body and thetan that an overwhelming has occurred."

The relevant section of that bulletin was entitled: **"Bottom Rung of Dianetics Found"** which is reassuring in that it means we probably don't have to dig any deeper into an engram to find any further charge.

Robert D.

Paul's Independent Academy Presents:

Additional R3X Notes

by Robert Ducharme

April 29, 2000
and April 20, 2003

Grinding and Earlier Beginning
If an incident seems to be grinding, check for an earlier beginning. You could also ask Pc if the charge is coming from that incident or from elsewhere. If it's coming from that incident, then it's probably an earlier beginning, even if it's an earlier incident the Pc identifies as part of the incident being presently run. As a last resort, the alternate confront process can always be used. But it's always best to stick with procedure as much as possible rather than to go into unusual solutions.

Incident getting worse
When the Pc says that the incident got worse or stronger after the last pass through, you can ask him if he means that it got clearer or more real. If so, that should count as erasing, not more solid. An incident needs to be confronted before it's left for an earlier one.
Yes, that's important. One really wants to be running OTs with bright 3D perceptions of these incidents. One is erasing charge but the incidents don't disappear. At this level the Pre-OT is actually restoring communication and reach into the locations and times of the incidents.
Revenius
The whole idea is to disconnect the incident from the charge. Every incident can and should be run in the manner the narrative incident is run in the R-3R materials.

Acknowledgments
Acknowledgments (e.g. good, fine, alright, okay, thank you) need to be given after every command has been carried out and every question answered by the Pc. The reason is basically because it makes the Pc feel like he has been heard and smoothly completes the cycle of communication. The only exception to this rule is when having the person doing a mockup during a havingness process. To acknowledge the mockup would tend to as-is it prematurely.

Definitions
A Pc must fully understand each command before running it. If there is any doubt about any word, it should be defined. Any good dictionary can used for this. Before defining the term, I will ask the Pc what he thinks the definition is. This will get him to compare his past concepts of it with the common meaning. It will also validate his knowledge about it if he is right. In any case, I have found doing that to be a more causative and interesting way of defining

known words because of the active rather than passive role it promotes. It causes him to look and create rather than just passively think about and accept it. Previously unknown words are a different matter, and are handled without this step.

Erasing or going more solid
Incidents usually go through a bell curve pattern over a series of recountings where the incident may appear to get more solid, with TA rising, reach a peak, and then wane to erasure. The initial rise in TA is usually only the result of the Pc encountering more charge in the incident. When in doubt, the auditor can always ask something like "Is the charge coming from this incident, or elsewhere?" Each incident needs to be discharged before asking for an earlier similar, otherwise the earlier incidents can tend to run shallow or be blocked from view by the charge connected to the later incidents on the track, drawing the Pc's attention toward them and away from earlier track. Failure to consider this phenomenon has been one of the major weak points of the old R3R system. Yes, that was covered in Class 8 but never really exported from there. Revenius

Pre-MEST universe incidents
These incidents have far more charge to them because in that realm there is more free theta and more ability to create that charge. The pre-MEST area should be the minimum target for any auditor processing an advanced Pc. Physical universe incidents are minor by comparison. Clears and above normally have little trouble accessing this realm. When accessing pre-MEST incidents, Pcs will notice that time as we know it becomes nonexistent or irrelevant. Also, it should be really stressed that the Pcs postulates on the early track are much stronger. So when you're getting up into the OT realms you could well get more charge off repeating the postulates than anything else. Revenius

To ask for time or duration will often get a confused response from the Pc., which is why I have dropped those steps.

The incident that must not be unmocked
When the Pc says that the as-isness of a particular incident will result in the destruction of the universe (or God, oneself, or the auditor, etc.), you may rest assured that that's nothing but a postulate put into the incident to keep the Pc from looking and thereby as-ising it, and that the universe will in fact not blow up or vanish. At least we've been lucky so far.

Auditor Zero Attitude
The secret to great auditing as opposed to good or average auditing lies in zero attitude - no attitude, full TR-0 - during the session. The auditor must be completely without emotional

reaction for the period of the session lest his case get entwined with the Pc's, even if only on a telepathic level. This means that the auditor must be totally non-judgmental in words and thoughts.

"Positive emotions can stick you as an ally and get a propitiative Pc." Revenius

Roteness of Commands and Clears
A fatal error in running Dianetics on Clears occurs when the Pc is fast while the auditor is rote. The auditor will say: "Move to that incident". Pc: "I'm there..." (itsas about it and blows it by inspection). Auditor: "What is the duration of the incident?" etc. etc. If the auditor is not tracking with the Pc, and seeing the situation for what it is, but watching the meter for reactions and querying them, or running rote commands just to be following procedure blindly, he can cause the Pc to unwittingly dub in an incident, creating protest charge in the Pc and mess up the session. When dealing with advanced and fast Pcs, the auditor must follow the Pc's lead, not the other way around. The auditor must at the same time, however, remain in control of the session.

The Shift
The Shift is an interesting phenomenon. It evidently contains no time, and yet it contains all the postulates in the incident. It is the "prior cause" in the incident, and so is the important part of it. When the incident is run to a flat point, the Shift will still be there. Rarely though, it will be blown along with the incident. But the Shift still needs to be asked for. If the auditor asks for a Shift and the Pc gives an at-effect experience, he should be wary of this and ask for the point where the Pc was feeling "like himself", and then have him move forward to find the Shift moment. This is similar in many ways to finding the misunderstood word, i.e. going back to the point where one felt comfortable with the text and moving forward to the blank area. The transition point is the misunderstood word. That could also be called the moment of Shift. The blank period following the misunderstood word is comparable to the Dianetic incident. Blow the prior confusion and the blank period following blows with it.

Shock or Shift?
I have used both terms, and both work. However, the term "Shift" is more cause than the term "shock". They usually occur pretty much simultaneously, but sometimes the shock occurs after the person creates the postulates and then shifts. The end result can still be erasure of the item, but the responsibility level tends to be higher when "Shift" is used. The Shift is what the Pc considers to be the single most significant part of the incident - at least by the end of the handling.

Alternate Confront Process, Use of
This process is extremely useful in unblocking stuck areas of track. The commands are: "What part of that (incident, Shift, or whatever) would you be willing to confront?" and "What part of that (incident) would you rather not confront?" This is done to an EP. Like

everything else, don't overrun. The EP usually happens fast.

When the Pc "Blows the Shift" Along with the Incident
I have determined that *every* basic incident contains a Shift point. It may appear to be blown, but it should be found and run anyway. I would probably choose to cancel any future R3XD with someone who refused to run a Shift after reaching Basic-Basic than to continue to process without handling Shifts.

The Influence of Personal GPMs on Present Time
Normally the GPM will start out being "way back on the track", but then as it is run, it will tend to encompass the entire track including present time. The Pc will often say things like "This is the story of my life", or "This has been the story of all my existences along the track", or "this incident is still happening right now". This apparency will blow off as soon as the postulates are discharged and the Shift cleaned up.

"This term "personal GPM" could get confusing. We're dealing with an engram that's significant in the Actual GPM and could be a joining of several chains on several dynamics. It's a point of significant valence shift in the living of the GPM." Revenius

I have since come to the conclusion that what one is dealing with in R3XD is nothing less than Actual GPMs, that is, self-created basic GPMs. The reason I refrain from using the term "Actual GPM" is because it has certain connotations from the old GPM tech from the 1960's which could be confusing. The term "GPM", however, I still maintain is a proper word for what R3XD deals with, despite what some "authorities" may maintain. The evidence of that is in comparing the definitions of the GPM from the Tech Dictionary and from some of the GPM lectures with what is being run with R3XD, and in the fact that no mental mass will stand up to the R3XD procedure properly run by the book.

Indicating F/Ns
Since I have been auditing this procedure almost exclusively by phone, I have cut out F/N indications entirely. I have found absolutely no liability to doing this. What I do instead is to thoroughly acknowledge the end of cycle. So instead of saying "Your needle is floating", I might say something like "Very good. Alright." or something similar to let the person know I completely agree with his end of cycle. Like everything else in auditing, it should be spontaneous and heartfelt, not rote, even if it's predictable.
Preclears tend to benefit from very standard session procedure but it will bog down a fast running OT. Revenius

Through the "No Earlier Incident" Block
The R3R procedure is usually run in such a way that the auditor will accept almost any win as a basic incident. This leaves the Pc with a mere key-out instead of an erasure, no matter how

significant the cognition or how early on in the MEST universe it happened. This must be balanced with the rule of not pushing the Pc past his capabilities.

"It's even deeper than erasure really. I would go for restored ability to pervade the space and time of the incident." - Revenius

When the command "Is there an earlier incident where you had the feeling of...(item)...?" is used, and there is a read, you can ask "Did you think of something when I asked that?" and do 2-way communication on it. Steering is an option, but I'd rather keep the Pc from being meter dependent, so I use that method as last resort. If I get a "No" response but the meter did read, I will ask "Did you have a thought flash-by right when I asked that?" or something like that, and pursue that.

If nothing shows up, I will then ask (always with good TR-1) "Is there an earlier incident before the beginning of time where you had the feeling of ...(item)...?" If the Pc is well set up, this question should read big time. So then you run the pre-MEST universe bank back earlier similar, earlier similar, until there is nothing earlier. Then you ask for the flow zero incident with the command "Is there an earlier incident where you caused yourself to have the feeling of ...(item)...?" If it doesn't indicate to the Pc, then you run the Shift on the incident just run. If at any time there is a bog on running the Shift of that incident, one place to look at is an earlier incident again. Sometimes it will surface when running the later Shift triggers it. This phenomenon rarely occurs though.

If the incident already handled, seems to the Pc like it might be the basic, the auditor can give the Pc the R-factor that the "Earlier similar" question is routine and may not indicate.

The earliest incident I've ever seen people run has been the "Original Separation from Theta" incident as mentioned on the "Individual Track Map" in the Tech Bulletins, which evidently is on everybody's track. Each Pc seems to have a unique take on it, but the basic story is similar from Pc to Pc. Not every Pc is ready to run this incident. Some run it the first time they have a session. Once a Pc runs this incident, it will thereafter probably be "Basic-Basic" for all or most subsequent items run thereafter. This is good and will lead to accelerated positive case change for him. Apparently Basic-Basic can have many aspects, each of which may constitute a GPM incident in itself.

Through the Past Life Barrier

If the Pc has never run past lives but is willing to, you can get him started when he has no earlier incident this lifetime. You give him the "Earlier similar" command and hope for the best.

The following are some methods of approach when he does not respond favorably to the E/S

command:

1. You give him the "Earlier similar" command, check the meter for an instant read, and then you can ask him if a picture, thought, or feeling flashed in his mind when you asked the "Earlier similar" question. Then you follow that up.

2. You can ask him if he can still feel the somatic he started the session with. If so, you can ask him to use his imagination and tell you what sort of scenario might explain or accompany the picture, thought or feeling he has. The same means can be used to open up blank areas of track like operations or implants. Then you get the Pc to "make up a story" about what the incident would be like if it were to have happened. Then you run him through it again and again until his reality on it picks up and the incident eventually flattens. Pay special attention to areas he talks about that gets good reads and have him expand on those.

Handling of Feelings
From the point of asking for feelings in the Shift on forward, all feelings are put into a statement (postulate) form by the preclear and then repeated until flat. The preclear can, and should, change the wording if it changes for him to something more appropriate while repeating. (Always preface the questions with "in or around that moment of Shift...) For example, "fear" can become "I can't confront anything," or "This is more than I can bear," or "I have to avoid this situation at all costs". Fear could also be simply "I am afraid". The Pc should break down the feeling into its component parts if possible, but he should not be forced into an unreality either. I always try to get the Pc to get the phrase down without using the name of the emotion (like "afraid") in that phrase.

If possible, the Pc should repeat the postulate as though he were making it in present time: "I can't confront" rather than "I lost my ability to confront". But this a judgment call.

If he's not stating it as if it's present time then he's looking back on it and isn't as-ising it. You can shift tenses for him. For example if he says "I lost my confront" you could lead in with "Get the point where you are losing your confront -- what's the postulate you are making?" - Revenius

Also, qualifiers should be eliminated such as "I feel like" or "I guess". The idea is to get the Pc as close to duplicating the original postulate as possible. Again, if it's real to the Pc, he can run a statement like "I feel..." and see where it leads. Best to let the Pc be the final judge, or at least not force him into a direction that is unreal to him.

After they have been repeated a few times, I will ask the Pc "How does the feeling of _____ seem to you now?" If it is flat, I will go on to the next feeling. If it is not flat I will have the

Pc look at the feeling as it is now (I ask "What does the feeling seem like now?") and have him turn that feeling into a statement form and repeat that until flat. Postulates often contain a pronoun such as "I" or "me" or "you".

If the Pc doesn't know what to look for and needs help, the auditor can suggest possible phrases in question form like "I can't _____ any more?" or I'm unable to _____?" or "I'll never _____ again?".

If Pc still cannot find wording for the feeling, then he can be started out by having him use the phrase "I have to _____" or "I have to avoid _____" along with the appropriate ending, and have him repeat that. Another way is to lightly suggest some possible phrases to him. The stable datum here is that all feelings are basically postulates.

If it is a feeling of pain or physical sensation, there may be no words for that yet (this rarely occurs. Just have the preclear feel that feeling in the sense of accepting it and letting it follow its cycle to completion). After you ask, "How does it seem now?" it may be in a form which can be run as a postulate by repeater technique.

You don't want to be handling present time somatics with the repeater technique, so if there is any question about that, ask if that somatic is part of the pre-MEST incident being handled or if it's only present time.

Dichotomies
It doesn't hurt to ask if a feeling being run has an opposing side like "I hate you" and "I love you", or "I can't _____" and "I must _____". If it does, the two sides are run by repeater technique 1,2,1,2,1,2 to a flat point. In fact, sometimes it's necessary to run the opposite side for it to blow.

Op-Term Feelings
It's also good to check for any feelings any opposition terminals had and run those out too by getting the Pc to repeat the op-term phrase from the op-term's point of view.
Yes, plus the other dynamics. Let's say you start in with a feeling of degradation about a past situation. You'd want to pick up the emotions and postulates throughout his group. These things are part of the telepathic aspect of the incident that needs to be addressed and would block an EP if left there. Another point that needs to be thrown in is the old "Stuck pictures" from '68 . Incidents can hang up on those points and earlier Dianetics was a bit too rote to get them.
Stuck pictures are normally handled by using the Before/After process.

Additional Notes: 20 April 2003

The Primary Purpose of this Process
It must be kept in mind that the primary purpose of running R3XD is not to take away a person's items and restimulations. The purpose is to locate and discharge GPM masses at their source, thus bringing about maximum case gain per session hour. It may appear to be just a "negative gain" process at first glance, but it acts positively in restoring a being's full responsibility for his creations. The end result is a greater degree of OT ability.

Basic and Basic-Basic
Any incident can act as a "basic" as long as the charge is keyed out. I consider the "Original Separation from Theta" incident to be Basic-Basic. Any later incident, with no apparent earlier incident on the chain where the charge is at least keyed out, I call a basic.

Stuck Picture
If Pc complains of a "stuck picture", give him the commands, "Spot a moment before the picture", (ack); "Spot a moment after the picture", (ack) repetitively, done 1, 2; 1, 2; 1, 2; etc. until the picture frees up.

Entity Interference with Session
If the presence of an entity is found to be interrupting the session, find out if it's in present time or in the incident. If the entity is in the incident, ignore the entity and follow standard procedure. If the entity is in the present, use entity handling tech and return the Pc to the standard session as soon as possible. Entity handling, as relates to this procedure, is not a priority and so should not be done unless the standard session becomes stalled as a result.

No Auditor's Ego
For maximum results, the auditor must be completely egoless during the session, which means full attention on the Pc, and muzzled auditing with minimal communication, and no flippant remarks, jokes, or questions that are not pertinent to the sessions, i.e. no communications that take the Pc's attention away from his case. The auditor's curiosity is not important, his understanding is. Questions aimed at clarifying possible misunderstoods by the auditor are permissible in order to avert a break in reality in the session and to keep the auditor tracking with the Pc.

Pc Trying to Solve his Problem
Once in a while the Pc will attempt to offer a solution or try to justify the situation, as by looking at it philosophically rather than run through the incident or shock moment one more

time. This should be viewed as an effort to alter-is rather than as-is and should not be countenanced. If this gets in the way of the session, the Pc might well be given an R-factor on what is expected of him, and then the standard procedure continued.

Session Problems/No Correction Lists Needed
In all the time I've been auditing this process I've never needed a correction list for a session problem. At the first sign of trouble I simply ask the Pc what's going on, and I find that the Pc knows and will arrive at the answer if asked for it properly. The rule here is, "If you know the tech, you'll know which questions to ask".

Auditor Faith
The auditor should have faith in himself and in the process, and persist through any problems that might arise. Above all, the auditor should never panic, but always remain in control. Auditor's negative reaction can be sensed by the Pc. If the auditor is truly stumped - which should rarely - if ever, happen, he should end session, reassess the situation, and resume when ready, preferably within 24 hours.

Not Repeating Truthful Statements
The repeater technique for the Shift moment is done on statements with charge on them. If they're compulsive or lies, such as "I have to avoid pain" or "I'll never be the same again", then it can be repeated. If they're truths and uncharged like "I'm at cause" or "I'm not a victim", they should not be repeated as they will not as-is (unless of course there's a compulsive element to it). Sometimes the Pc has to have it clarified as to what is expected when "postulates" and "feelings" are asked for.

Incomplete Sessions
Incomplete sessions can be emotionally troubling for the Pc and should be handled as soon as possible, preferably within 24 hours. If, after hours of auditing a chain, the Pc becomes exhausted to where his ability to function is lowered, it may be best to call off the session and resume at a later time when the Pc can function more optimally. But this should not be done if it can be avoided, and the Pc should be returned to session as soon as possible.

Blowing Charge by Inspection
Use of this ability should not replace the detailed knowledge of incidents, especially when dealing with the basic on the chain. If a Pc appears to be "glibbing" his way through, he may have to be hatted on the value of thoroughly reexperiencing the incident as it was when it was first created. Those who are used to running NOTs procedure eventually get to a point where they "spot and poof" charge on incidents without going into any detail. This may or may not achieve the deep level as-isness required for deep case change. It may be on the same order as blowing a lock on a chain, which is fine for removing present time restimulation, but is different from recovery of abilities, which is the goal of R3X. Ideally, the Pc should be able

to reexperience incidents in 3D holographic detail. In pre-MEST incidents, the existence of things may be more conceptual than substantial, but the impact is greater because of the higher degree of responsibility for creation in that era. The more thoroughly and exactly that can be re-experienced the better, especially if it contains pain and other heavy sensations.

This is not to say that a Pc should be slowed down because things happen fast for him. The right speed is whatever speed works best for the Pc.

Shallow Sessions

When running chains of incidents that end with a MEST universe basic, I prefer to run straight Dianetic R3X rather than go into Shift handling. Either way will work, but I generally prefer to reserve Shift handling for pre-MEST incidents where the Pc can take responsibility for the whole incident and all viewpoints in it. In the case of running chains to a basic that is this lifetime or some other MEST universe lifetime, all 4 flows should be run on the item just as is done in R3R.

Robert Ducharme

Paul's Independent Academy Presents:

Additional Processes

By Robert Ducharme
April 20, 2003

6-Direction Process (was Over and Under Process)
This process is done to undercut Dianetics and lock scanning in handling long or highly charged incidents, series of incidents, or periods of time.
The process is an LRH process from 1959. It consists basically of having the Pc put the terminal (not an abstract idea) like a segment of track in each of the six directions. The commands are:

"Get that _____ and put it above you" "Good" "Put it below you" "Good" "Put it to the right of you" "Good" "Put it to the left of you" "Good" "Put it in front of you" "Good" "Put it above you" ... etc.

One can undercut the track-scanning function of this process by running the terminal first. For instance, before running the "period of time regarding Mother" one can run "Mother" with this process, and then run "Mother and self", as one terminal, afterwards. That action takes some of the charge off the top.

Before and After Process
This process is done mainly to help the Pc confront the specifics of an incident. It's often used to get the Pc past a stuck point. The commands are:

"Spot a moment before the incident" "Spot a moment after the incident."

Alternate Confront Process
This process can be done on a terminal when grinding occurs.

Commands: *"What part (or about) that ...(terminal)... could you confront?"* alternated with *"What part (or about) that ...(terminal)... would you rather not confront?"*

Robert Ducharme

Paul's Independent Academy Presents:

Other Topics

By Robert Ducharme
April 20, 2003

Remote Metering
Because of the phone processing setup, I use the meter on myself while running the Pc, and have been doing so for years. That way I can telepathically track with the Pc much more easily than otherwise. It's an ability that anyone is capable of. It's important to get a good Free Zone meter and set the sensitivity relatively high. On the Clarity meter I always set the sensitivity at 32 for remote metering.

Not Indicating F/Ns
When Dianetics is audited without a meter, one needn't indicate F/Ns. I figure why not follow the same method whether a meter is used or not. I never indicate F/Ns because I audit remotely by phone and use a meter remotely and telepathically by holding onto the electrodes myself. I have found no liability to not indicating F/Ns, plus it eliminates the meter dependency factor as well as wrong indications.

Handling of Rudiments
Of course the drugs-alcohol-aspirin-sleep-food issues still apply. As to problems, ARC breaks, and missed withholds, if the Pc has out-ruds, I merely have him lock scan from the previous session to present time. I accomplish that with the help of the Six-Direction process. The commands are:

1. "Get a concept of that period of time."
2. "Put it above you..." (etc. with the 6-Dir process)
3. "Move to the beginning of that period of time" "Scan through to the end of that period of time."

That's the basic formula, but the auditor can tailor-make the procedure to suit the Pc and the circumstance.

Robert Ducharme

Paul's Independent Academy Presents:

Dramatizations

By Robert Ducharme
October 10, 2003

From: A post to the
FreeZone America Board:
Posted October 10, 2003.

When I run a Pc on an item, I will make sure to leave each incident flat before moving on to the next incident, unless of course the Pc brings up the next incident, at which time he should be run on that one. If the Pc brings up several incidents at one time though, I will normally handle them all at once.

I don't run "marathon sessions" any more. One to two hours is average for a Dianetic session. Often a chain will be run over the span of several sessions. I always make sure to leave the session with the incident flattened. But until the entire chain is completely flat and the Shift run, the Pc may still dramatize the item between sessions, and often will. Often the key-out from the session will last a couple of days after which the dramatization will resume. Of course, if the chain is abandoned, it will eventually "key out", and the person will normally feel the same after the item has been run as before, or maybe somewhat better, but the item will still be far from completely handled.

So, between sessions, dramatizations of the item can be expected in many cases. But it's usually no worse than before the chain was started on. If the item is run, even on four flows, on just this lifetime, or a few lifetimes back without going further, no matter how "wonderful" the EP was, the item will likely continue to plague the Pc. Any further "handlings" on the item other than continuation of the chain will only be more solutions upon solutions - in other words, Q and A. The item, to be handled correctly, *must* be taken to its pre-MEST basic incident and the Shift handled. Sometimes you can get away with not handling the Shift, but all too often that will end up with a still-charged basic that will rob the Pc of benefit of the full EP (=item stably no longer an issue; Pc takes full responsibility for its initial creation; regained aspect of self previously tied up in maintaining the item.) I'd much rather be safe than sorry. No harm is done by running the Shift handling commands once even if they're already flat.

Now I've been talking here about life ruins, not just wimpy items that one runs on things like the Dianetic drug rundown. I only run items that really indicate to the Pc. Dianetic drug rundowns are something else.

Robert D.

Paul's Independent Academy Presents:

Do the Usual

By Robert Ducharme
April 19, 2002

From a post to the R3X thread on
the Freezone America Board:
Posted April 19, 2002.

When Confronted with the Unusual, Do the Usual
I gave a session to a Pc who had previously achieved an "ascension experience" or "epiphany" (I hate to call it simply "exteriorization"). Three days later he started having chronic tired feelings. So I had him run the whole period of time with a combination of R3R Narrative and 6-Dir. Afterwards he said he still was stuck on the part about the crash. So I had him get that point of crash (coming down) and did the 6-Dir process on that until it went flat. He cognited, reluctantly, on his own participation in the whole debacle. Afterwards he said he felt back on top again and his tired feelings and headache were suddenly gone. He just realized that staying on top of things required him to maintain a certain level of ethics in order for him to accomplish that.
Several times I was tempted to revert to some other process (though I knew better) since the 6-Dir process was taking some time (about 180 commands in all), but in the end persistence in sticking to the same process paid off.

Two lessons were evident here:

1. Adding complexities to a Dianetic processing program like correction lists, int/ext, prepchecking, L&N, etc., not to mention DCSI or Clear Certainty R/D was not needed to handle this type of problem. Dianetics in one form or another is a universal solvent for problems.

2. Persistence on one course rather than deviating from procedure pays off.

For all practical purposes, 6-Dir, Before/After and narrative style Dianetic R3R are interchangeable in Dianetic sessions, though they each serve specific functions. I've never run into any problems in interchanging them.

Robert D.

Paul's Independent Academy Presents:

Abridged Recap of R3X

By Robert Ducharme
April 20, 2003

Brief overview
1. First I *run the item by R3R*, with the provisos I outlined below in the differences between R3R and R3X (in other words, per the standard R3X procedure up to the Shift).
2. Then, when I've gotten the Pc to Basic-Basic, *I ask for the Shift moment* (equivalent to the shock moment of PAB 80 that Ron never pursued any further). There will *always* be one.
3. I then get the Pc to assume the *viewpoint of each of the dynamics at that moment* and then view the Shift from each of those vantage points (the list has been updated on formerscio). That's the most crucial part of the Shift handling process. It's like each of the dynamics doing a contact assist.
4. Next I *ask for the main goals* (which cause the persistence) and flatten those by repeater.
5. Then I *ask for a computation* (which justifies the game's perpetuation) and flatten that by repeater.
6. Then as a final touch, *I run "Responsibility" on the incident.* By this time the Pc is ready to take honest and full responsibility for the incident along all dynamics.
7. Then to "polish off" the end product I have *the Pc scan his track on the given item on each of the 4 flows.*
8. I always end off with the *scanning of the session* and *two havingness processes.*

That's basically all there is to it.

From the Start to the Shift
Run the item as one would with R3R as modified by the R3X write-up. Be sure to flatten each incident along the way. R3X up to the basic incident is basically run with the rules of the R3R Narrative procedure except for the "earlier incident" command.

If the Pc says there is no earlier incident to a MEST universe incident previously run, ask:
"Is there an earlier incident, possibly before the beginning of time..."(or "...in the Theta Universe...") where you had the feeling of ...(item)...?"
You pick the formulation that indicates to the Pc.

All items have their basis in the Theta Universe. Even body problems have comparable concepts in Theta incidents.

If the Pc says there's no earlier incident but has not hit Basic-Basic, ask:
"Is there an earlier incident, possibly around the original separation (individuation, break off) from Static (Source, yourself -- whatever indicates) where you had the feeling of ...(item)...?"

The basic incident should have a pleasant pre-beginning. If the incident starts unfavorably, then have the Pc look for an earlier beginning until he finds a point before the bad feeling starts.

When the basic incident, hopefully Basic-Basic, has been flattened completely, the auditor asks the Pc for a moment of Shift, the first one, and asks to Pc to describe it (like "from what to what?").

Handling the Shift
The following is the checklist of points covered in the Shift handling as I do it now. It's a rudimentary list and is only an adjunct to the full write-up of the R3X process found elsewhere in these materials.
I run this process on people on an almost daily basis and have been doing so for the last several years. The process, when done correctly, will resolve the item in question smoothly and flawlessly every single time. Each individual action is done to the E/P of F/N, cognition, VGIs. No need to insist on what the cog was, though. Doing so (or any roteness) can be annoying to the Pc.

* before/after process on the Shift
* "Move thru that moment of Shift from beginning to end."
* viewpoint after Shift
* vp before Shift
* vp of others (Others can always be found after the Shift if not before, and should be run regardless of Pc interest in that one)
* vp of creations (This is the MEST equivalent. Any creations, energies, agreements, etc. will do)
* pan determined vp
* vp of games (...or not. I've dropped it as a command)]
* vp of being
* vp of infinite being (All That Is)
* vp of Source (source of All That Is, source of all consciousness)
* As Static ("As Static, experience that moment of Shift from beginning to end")
* As Static backwards ("As Static, experience that moment of Shift backwards from the end to the beginning.")
* Check for any undesirable feelings from the incident and handle. By this time there are normally none left.
* Check for goals and handle. There is always at least one pair of goals in opposition as relates to the item. You may have to start the Pc out on repeating one goal first until the opposing goal becomes more real to him, at which time you have him repeat both.

* Get and handle any computation. There is always at least one. (If the Pc if insists there is none and none can be found, then it may be better to let it go at that, but that's very rare. Finding a computation can sometimes be tricky--especially when running the dynamics.)
* Run "Responsibility" process on incident. The Pc should wind up taking full responsibility for the basic incident.
* Check back on the present status of any phrases, feelings, or shocks noted down on the work sheet from later incidents and handle accordingly. By now they should all be flat.
* Scan 4 flows from basic to PT.
* Scan the item itself: "Scan out the item ... wherever you find it exists in the universe." or any similar command. (This step works on high-level Pcs, but it's still experimental at this time as to who it can be used on.) (I have now dropped this step too.)
* Ask Pc how the item is.
* Ask him if he could recreate it again if he wanted to. (This is an optional step.)
* Run havingness processes.

Robert Ducharme

Paul's Independent Academy Presents:

Differences Between R3R and R3X

By Robert Ducharme
April 20, 2003

With R3R the auditor tends to end off on a late-on-the-chain win.	With R3X the auditor always asks for an earlier incident regardless of wins. The two additional questions besides the "earlier-incident" question, are "Is there an earlier incident - possibly before the beginning of time - where you had the feeling of ... (item)...?" for a pre-MEST basic, and "Is there an earlier incident - possibly around the original separation from theta (or "split-off from Static" or something to that effect) where you had the feeling of ...(item)...?" for Basic-basic".
With R3R the auditor tries to get the Pc to an earlier incident first chance he gets. This has at least two liabilities and is a bad policy.	With R3X the auditor flattens each incident along the way per narrative incident running technique.
With R3R the chain ends with the asking of a postulate.	With R3X the moment of Shift (the earliest one) is asked for. I never ask for a shock any more. BTW, *only a Shift as that* is more causative and earlier.
With R3R you can't use additional tools.	With R3X, ample use is made of the Six-Direction process and Before/After process, and occasionally Alternate Confront. The 6-Dir process tends to undercut running of heavy masses and series of incidents, the B/A process tends to open up occluded incidents and rapidly and painlessly dispatch single incidents, and A/C tends to reveal the hidden underpinnings of grinding incidents. I rarely have to resort to the latter any more. The 6-Dir is the most powerful and useful process of the three as far as I can tell. You can also shift over to entity handling if it's appropriate.

With R3R you can't run anybody above Grade 4.	With R3X you don't have to worry about who you run whether in the pre-OT or "non-interference" zone.
With R3R you hopefully get a resolution of the item, most likely as a late-on-the-chain key-out.	With R3X you get a permanent resolution of the item by reason of the Pc taking full responsibility for it along all dynamics. In addition, the Pc recovers long-lost aspects of himself from the incidents.
With R3R the commands are rote.	With R3X the commands are always fitted to the needs of the moment.
R3R is used mainly for handling somatics.	R3X is used for mainly spiritual expansion.
With R3R you ask for the beginning of the incident.	With R3X you ask for the point *just before* the incident began (so as to include the Shift/shock of every incident).
With R3R you ask for "an earlier incident".	With R3X you ask for "another incident", except in instances the auditor would determine the word "earlier" to be more apt for the given situation.

Paul's Independent Academy Presents:

Shift Handling Checklist

By Robert Ducharme

April 20, 2003

Revised Oct. 10, 07, to align with "R3X Procedure"

Shift Handling Checklist:

1. *Before/After:* Spot a moment before the Shift. Spot a moment after the Shift

Move Through's: Move Through, Scan, Experience

2. Move through that moment of Shift from beginning to end.
Add as indicated: ...that moment of Shift from beginning to end
3. From the VP you had after the Shift, move though...
4. From the VP you had before Shift, move though...
5. From the VP of the all others, move though...
6. From the VP of [each relevant terminal present], move though...
7. From the VP of all others...**scan all of the others' time tracks.**
8. From the VP of any resulting creations (of MEST); From that VP, move though...
9. From that VP of (MEST creations) ...**scan all of their time tracks.**
10. From a pan-determined VP, experience...
11. From the VP of just being, experience...
12. From the VP of Infinite Being (All That Is), experience...
13. From the VP of Source (Source of all being or all consciousness), experience...
14. *As a Static:* As Static, experience that moment of Shift from beginning to end.
15. *Static backwards:* As Static experience that moment of Shift backwards from the end to the beginning.

Repeater Technique Items

16. *Feelings:* In or around that moment of Shift is there any other feeling or emotion?
(Find statement behind. E.g.: "fear" = "I can't confront anything")
17. Check on any feelings or postulates mentioned in the running. (Repeat each to Flat)
18. *Handle goals; at least 2 related to item:* In or around that moment of Shift is there any goal?
(Repeat each to Flat)
19. ***Get computations****. Ask for:* what postulate enabled you to still be right?
(or similar wording) (Repeat each to Flat)
Or try:
Is there any parallel between this incident and the events of this lifetime? *(get itsa)*
Can you find a pro-survival computation that has made this item appear useful to you?
(Repeat each to Flat)

(For any postulate/goal being run, always look for an opposing one to run along with it.)

20. **Run "Responsibility" process on incident**
What part of that incident could you be responsible for?
What part of that incident would you rather not be responsible for?

21. Scan four flows from basic to present
From this incident forward to pt, scan through...
F1: ...all the incidents where you had the feeling of (item)
F2: ...all the incidents where you caused another or others to have the feeling of (item)
F3: ...all the incidents where others caused others or themselves to have the feeling of (item)
F0: ...all the incidents where you caused yourself to have the feeling of (item)

22.*Optional; scan the item itself:*
Scan out the item _____ wherever you find it exists in the universe.
(This step works on high-level Pcs, but is still experimental as to who can run it.)

23. How does the item seem to you now?

24. Scan session:
Move to the beginning of this session
Move through to the end of this session

25. **Run Pc's Havingness processes.**

26. *Give:* End of session.

(Extracted from R3X Procedure. If any conflicts, use the original issues)

Paul's Independent Academy Presents:

R3XD Auditing the Dynamics

By Robert Ducharme
April 20, 2003

Once a Pc can be counted on to reach Basic-Basic, he can be started on the dynamics. This is essentially what Revenius was referring to when he originally named the process Routine 3 Expanded by Dynamics. I caught on a year later and started doing this action, and it has been a resounding success. The dynamics are run out one after the other in order 1 through 8. The basic command is "...an incident where you experienced the ...(number)... dynamic."

One would start by getting the dynamic defined.

Next step would be to ask the Pc to expand his space to encompass the ...(specific)... dynamic.

That would be followed by the command*:*

"Locate an incident where you experienced the ...(specific)... dynamic."

This should always be taken back to Basic-Basic and the Shift handled.

If a person wants to go even further along this line, he can also do each of the dynamics through again, but this time "as the viewpoint of the All That Is", with the commands changed to fit that format.

Robert Ducharme

Paul's Independent Academy Presents:

Possible Items

By Robert Ducharme
February 25, 2003

Posted to Yahoo's formerscio list:
From: "Robert D."
Date: Feb 25, 2003.
Subject: R3XD - more data

Here is a list of possible items for running with the R3X process. They are simply items I've been jotting down in notes over the last several months. They're (mostly) in alphabetical order and not in logical sequence.
I would assess the list for items only after the 8 dynamics had been cleared with R3XD.
Some items may be redundant, superfluous, or not profitable to run. I don't know as I haven't run many of them yet. Some are basic items culled from LRH lectures and books.
On another subject, I am finding that running the 8 dynamics with R3XD from the viewpoint of the All That Is can lead to the person, from then on, running all items from the viewpoint of the All That Is and so clear the item on a grander scale and possibly affect the universe in ways that go beyond conventional thinking. Everybody who has run the dynamics from the ATI viewpoint so far assures me that they are definitely satisfied with the results and that it's a course well worth pursuing.

Also, an additional command I've been using is to have the Pc scan the time tracks of all the other individuals in the basic Shift area. That is done after having the Pc scan the Shift from the viewpoints of all the individuals or others. The command also works for the MEST viewpoint.

[Various scales or lists are shown first. Then follow items in alphabetical order. No attempt has been made to indicate relative importance.-Ed.]

Scales containing many items:
Awareness Levels
Chart of Attitudes Dichotomies
Emotional Tone Scale items
Int Buttons
Know-to-Mystery Scale items
LX Lists

Prepcheck Buttons

Individual Items:
Abandonment
Affinity, reality, or communications breaks
Agony
Agreement
Anguish
Annoyed
Apathy
Assumptions (of bodies)
Assumptions (of beingness)
Automatically
Bad cause
Betrayal
Blame
Boredom
Can't change
Can't start
Can't stop
Careful about
Circuits
Cold
Competition
Confusion
Control (repressed or compulsive)
Creation, survival, destruction
Critical
Curious
Degradation
Desire
Disgust
Disinterest
Distrust
Emotional Tone Scale (as a single item)
Emotions - (repressed or compulsive)
Energy
Enforce
Entrapment
Ethics conditions
Evaluation

Explosions
Failure
Falsely accused
Fear (a cause of out ethics)
Force
Forgetting - amnesia
Glee of insanity
Guilt
Hate
Having to be something+no right to be nothing
Havingness (feeling of lack of)
Hit by barrier and holding on
Humiliated
Impatience
Inadequate
Inhibit
Injustice
Insanity (as an emotion)
Insulted, demeaned
Interiorization
Intimidation of ("too much") freedom
Invalidation
Jealousy
Ugliness
Location
Body attachment
Loss
Lostness
Machinery
Making nothing out of (something/someone)
Making pictures (as an automaticity)
Matter
Mechanisms of agreement
Mind games
Missed withhold
Must agree
Need for attention
Occlusion -- forgetting
Other-determined
Out-created (as invalidation)
Overwhelmed

Ownership
Pain
Panic
Power
Rage
Regret
Rejection
Resentment
Resisting
Restraint
Ridicule
Sadness
Scarcity
Self-consciousness
Self-righteousness
Seriousness
Service facsimile
Shame
Shock
Space
Stimulation & sensation
Superiority
Terror
Time
Unable to act
Unable to punish
Victim
Waiting to agree
Weak - tired - ineffective
Wonder (amazement?)
Work (as a negative feeling)
Worry

Robert Ducharme

Paul's Independent Academy Presents:

A Rehab with R3X

By Robert Ducharme

July 28, 2003

From a post to the R3X thread on
the Freezone America Board:
Posted July 28, 2003.

My Pc who had completed clearing of the 8 dynamics on R3XD told me that he was "flying high" (to use his term) for a good while after our last session a few months ago. I suppose it could be called an ascended or ascension state. He also told me that some time ago since then he suddenly crashed from that state. It happened when a big business deal he was counting on fell through. He hadn't reached that ascended state since that time.
So I thought this would be a great opportunity to investigate this phenomenon and see how things would develop as a result of processing it.
First thing I asked him was when that crash occurred and to tell me about it. I then asked him what major feeling was involved in the incident and he said "loss". Then I asked him for the postulate that brought on the crash. He said "It can't all keep going right" and "You've got to have something fall apart"
So, using the R3X procedure we ran "It can't all keep going right" as an attitude.
There was a long chain of that pattern of events throughout MEST universe existence and stemming from early on in the Theta universe. I had him eventually return to the Basic-Basic on the chain. I won't go into the details, but he saw exactly how that attitude was created from an effort to make nothing out of other thetans' creations.
As a result of the processing, he had gained some new insights he hadn't realized before.
After the processing was over I asked him about his former ascended state and he said that it felt like it was fully rehabbed.
And of course with each item run there is also a certain amount of theta one newly regains after having parked it on the time track for so long.

Robert D.

Paul's Independent Academy Presents:

Tone Scale Items

By Robert Ducharme
February 23, 2004

From a post to the R3X thread on
the Freezone America Board:
Posted February 23, 2004.

It pays to assess the tone scale as a source of charge. A lot of people seem to indicate on anger and fear, but those are among the more obvious dramatizations in society. The other tones may actually indicate more strongly, which is why assessment pays off.

What running out a tone level does is to take any out-of-controlness off that tone level and so the person can afterwards dramatize that tone or not at will if he so chooses. What else running it does is to take all the overts and motivators off of the item so that it is then clean of any hidden postulates.

I find that practically every item you can name is classifiable under one tone level or another. So why not start by running out the entire tone level rather than running "fear of cats" or "sadness about death" or "angry at parents" etc.? Why not run "fear", "grief", and "anger"?

Robert D.

Paul's Independent Academy Presents:

New Pc Assessment

By Robert Ducharme
September 12, 2004

From a private e-mail to and from Robert on the subject of how to find out what to run on a new client:

At 11:06 AM 9/11/2004 -0700, you wrote:

Hi Robert,
It's a question of writing about something that is probably so obvious to you, but isn't obvious to someone who has not audited a lot of people.
Someone telephones you and says, "Er, hello, is that Mr. Ducharme?... My name is Mrs. Jones. I got your name from Dr. Kendrick, who suggested that I call you."
What happens next? "Tell me, Mrs. Jones, what seems to be the problem?" Or, "Mrs. Jones, who are the main people in your life?" Or, "Mrs. Jones, what is your attention on?" Or, "Mrs. Jones, what causes the most stress in your life?"
Would you first go for terminals? Feelings? Periods of time generally?
Please give a bit more detail.

Paul

It's very intuitive. I just give a D of P interview and find out what needs to be handled. It's like one does Book-1 auditing. You do 2-way communication with the person to find out what the person's needs are, and then handle them. I don't have any complicated system, but if anyone needs one, the R3RA model will do.

When I run out of troublesome incidents (like father's death, or operations, or his past regarding his suppressive boss), I will normally do life scanning, then do whatever chains need to be addressed, and when I know the person can run Basic-Basic with the Shift, I can then go on to running the dynamics.

Robert D.

Paul's Independent Academy Presents:

New Pc Program

By Robert Ducharme
May 16, 2007

From posts to the Yahoo Group, Dianetic R3X.
May 16, 2007

This article was published after the checksheet was written. Obviously, it has great interest to beginning R3X auditors.

The proper gradient that has a track record of working is:

1. Obvious major incidents run narrative style.
2. Lifetime scanning starting with chain scanning out the last few months or so to start out with and moving on to the first 5 or 10 (usually 10) years of life.
3. Charged terminal rundown, running it for the entire lifetime at once on each of the flows. By the time the lifetime scanning cycle is finished, running the entire lifetime regarding a terminal is not a problem. Usually I like to get to the influences in childhood (like the parents) as soon as possible. Sometimes the present time spouse or place of work takes precedence though.
4. Finding a charged item and running it whole track. If the person cannot go backtrack, one can always end up with scanning out this lifetime 4 flows regarding that item.

Of course there could always be exceptions, but the above is the usual course.

Robert D.

(And the response to some questions re this):

On #2, Robert, would you suggest running this generally, then by four flows?

I always do it that way. The first [general] scans run the surface charge, then running each of the other flows always uncovers more and deeper charge.

And do you have any comments now on doing the four flows on the first chunk of time, then the

four flows on the second chunk of time etc.; or on doing the first flow command through the whole lifetime, chunk by chunk, then the second flow through the whole lifetime etc.?

I have done it both ways. I prefer to do it all at once right away because the basic charge for this lifetime is in childhood, plus if the person's attention is already on one particular chunk of time, we might as well continue with the other flows on it. But it will work either way.

On #3, similarly, run it generally first on a terminal before doing the four flows?

Yes. I don't see any downside to taking that extra step. It doesn't really take any longer to do it that way and it takes some of the "debris" out of the way first.

Robert D.

Paul's Independent Academy Presents:

Telepathic Metering

By Paul Adams
June 28, 2004

From Yahoo's freezoneaoint group:
[the post has been edited for this article on the R3X checksheet.
Full version at: www.fzglobal.org]

One of the major points of disagreement with RD's practice is that he holds the cans while auditing someone else. That far outweighs less important points.
Thank you very much, XXXX, for your thoughtful and sensible comments. I really appreciate it. For the rest of my e-mail, "you" refers to the reader, and not specifically to XXXX.

Any time up till six months ago I would have completely agreed on that point. For several years I had sometimes come across Robert's posts about getting reads like that, and my idea of how impossible it was completely overshadowed anything else that he was saying. I never saw any posts from anyone saying they had been getting auditing from Robert and how messed up they were as a result; and Robert kept saying how it always worked very well on his Pcs. But it was all so impossible that I couldn't even begin to accept what he was saying at face value. Or even look at it.
An analogy: It is said that what Galileo saw in the early 17th century was so disturbing for some officials of the Catholic Church that they refused to even look through his telescope; they reasoned that the Devil was capable of making anything appear in the telescope, so it was best not to look through it. If you think it is preposterous of me to position Robert with Galileo, well, point taken, but it's really not that important compared to the rest of it, so let's continue.
About six months ago I started doing a lot of reading in subjects that interested me, but are outside mainstream thought. Subjects like homeopathy, dowsing...
...The point is that there is a whole wealth of data in the world outside of Scn that deals with effects being caused at a distance...
...but even most Scientologists accept the idea of action at a distance through "theta" or "postulates".
There is a famous book by Abbe Mermet called "The Principles and Practice of Radiesthesia", written (in French) in 1935. I read an English translation. The subject of dowsing for water is probably familiar to most, to a lesser or greater extent. An expert dowser can locate water flowing one hundred feet underground, as well as such details as the direction of flow, the flow rate, and how drinkable it is. If he is practiced in it, the same dowser can determine the same information from one hundred miles away.

You might think this is getting ridiculous, but remember that these same dowsers probably think practicing Scientologists are a bunch of freaking weirdo's too. It is difficult to have affinity for a subject you have no reality on or communication with.
Abbe Mermet used a simple pendulum held in his hand to determine information at a distance, and he was an acknowledged master at it. His book contains dozens of testimonials from professionals in more normal fields, attesting to his accuracy, whether in locating water underground from a thousand miles away, diagnosing illness over a similar distance, or locating the body of a missing person.
Abbe Mermet considered himself a simple priest, and did not speculate too much on how the information he could pluck out of thin air, so to speak, was available to him. If one wishes to speculate, one is faced with the fait accompli of the feasibility of map dowsing, where an expert dowser can locate an item on a map in front of him, without ever having seen the location portrayed on the map. Possible theories include those like...
But the idea of a person's emotional charge reading on a meter connected up to the body of a distant auditor, while being in excellent ARC with that auditor on the telephone at the same time, while the auditor has all his attention devoted to the task at hand, is not nearly as far-fetched as locating a heap of inanimate iron ore buried a hundred feet down from a hundred miles away. The dowser isn't on the telephone with the iron ore, isn't personally concerned with its welfare, and is using a lump of wood or metal on a string, not an ultra-sensitive electronic instrument!
Anyway, after reading a pile of books on dowsing and other fields, I grew comfortable with the idea of "plucking information out of thin air", at least as a possibility. That doesn't mean I became an instant expert at it, just that I believed it was possible for others to do it.
Some weeks later I came across Robert Ducharme again. This time I did not automatically bounce off what he wrote, because what he said he did no longer sounded impossible to me. I read what he said with interest. I actually dug up every single post of his I could find anywhere, and read all of it. He does talk about other subjects, but mostly he talks about R3X and R3XD.
There are three big problems with R3X or R3XD. Most importantly, in general consideration anyway, is that he holds the cans and says it's the Pc reading on the meter and not himself. Secondly, although it can be run in a normal session in the same room, he normally runs it over the telephone, with the auditor at home and the Pc wherever. And third, although it is based on sound Scn principles and practices, it is not standard R3R. And he runs it on Clears and OTs.
Ten weeks ago, I wanted to get some auditing. Apart from some great gains on the Clay Table processes of Pro Trs, I hadn't made any real case gain since OT3 in about 1980. I'd had maybe two hundred hours of sec checks in the SO, but that doesn't count. I checked with Ralph over prices for NOTs, but with travel and living expenses it was too much money for me.

I looked at RD and R3X/R3XD. This time I didn't have a problem with the remote metering. I didn't know if he could do what he said he did, but I didn't have a theoretical problem with it any more. Similarly with the telephone auditing. I know from personal experience that if you have

good ARC with the person at the other end of the phone, and your attention is fully on that person, you can pick up a surprising amount of information. As for the "improvement" on R3R, well, maybe. I mean, LRH improved on R3R with NED. I didn't know if R3X did what RD said it did, but I didn't have any theoretical problem with it.

And that left this: I didn't understand how you could beneficially run Dn on a Clear or OT. But I had had hundreds of hours of R3R before 1978 when the Dn Clear HCOB came out, and it seemed to run OK then, so maybe it was possible to some extent. Whether or not it worked I didn't know, but no-one said it was bad. All there was on the Internet was several years' worth of Robert banging the drum saying how he'd been auditing it for years full-time with no problems and how uniformly good it was; and everyone else saying how impossible it was for Robert to be doing what he said he was doing without offering any criticism beyond that.

I've been involved with several "impossible" things in my life. Scientology is one of them. So I called Robert and a few days later I was in session.

So far I have had about 25 hours of R3X/R3XD. I had a session today, in fact. I've booked the next session, I'm paid up to date, and I anticipate many more sessions. I'm a happy camper. I think it's great stuff, and it reaches parts that other auditing doesn't touch. Yes, if I were full OT7, L's completion, and Class VIII, I would be in a better position then to evaluate the full "standard" bridge. So what? If money had been no object, I would probably have been camping out at Ralph's for the past two months. But I like being able to lie on my own bed in my underwear and have a great session handling some real basic Actual GPM stuff, in a relaxed style that even clears up any faintest traces of session BPC. As for it all being impossible, well OK, so it's impossible. I don't care if it's impossible. We're doing it.

Paul Adams

Copyright ©2004 by Paul Adams.

Paul's Independent Academy Presents:

Telepathic Metering 1

By Robert Ducharme
April 26, 2002

From a post to the
Freezone America Board:
Posted April 26, 2002.

I have no special preferences as to who I process as long as they are cooperative. I do many that are raw meat [as well as Scios]. I just give them a basic R-factor and handle them according to their cases. Usually I have to clean up this lifetime first before getting into past existences.

I used to run Dianetic auditing and Idenics by phone without a meter. I was forced into that position because of my location, which is distant from main Scn areas, the closest one being Miami. All I would do would be to ask the Pc for the data I needed at the moment. That worked quite well. Then I began to use a meter on myself and found that I was able to pick up reads telepathically. I recently wrote an article in the Free Spirit magazine about that technique, which I will post here at some time in the future.

Telepathic metering is simple and based on the premise that communications impinge and that that impingement, however subtle, will register on the meter. I use a Clarity meter and use it with the sensitivity up to 32, which is quite a bit higher than the normal range (normal being about 8). I have found that, with this technique, for the purpose of auditing, I could know everything I needed or wanted to know about the Pc's responses during the auditing procedure. I can even run repetitive processes, which I haven't been able to do without a meter. I just don't indicate floating needles for obvious reasons, but nobody seems to mind.

Robert D.

Paul's Independent Academy Presents:

Telepathic Metering 2

By Robert Ducharme
April 26, 2002

From a post to the
Freezone America Board:
Posted April 26, 2002.

Telepathic auditing & John McMaster

One point I am adamant about is that telepathic auditing is doable by *anybody.* All one needs is a good Free Zone meter, and the desire and willingness to do it.

I'm sure John Mac did telepathic auditing with the Pc on the meter or with no meter. I'm also fairly sure that he didn't use a meter on *himself* to audit others. Doing the latter is what makes all the difference when one has only average telepathic perceptions. It's a lot easier to do than one might think. It's just not within the *reality* of the average Scio, even though it's within his *capability.*

Robert Ducharme

Paul's Independent Academy Presents:

Telepathic Metering 3

By Robert Ducharme

September 5, 2003

From a post to the
Freezone America Board:
Posted September 5, 2005.

I wouldn't get my hopes up too high that the reads would necessarily coincide [i.e. with the auditor and Pc each holding a set of cans simultaneously]. I would just try the solo cans and practice using the meter telepathically for a while until it becomes obvious that the reads are on the Pc and not the auditor.

I use the meter mainly for simple things like detecting areas of charge and spotting release points and EPs. For more exacting uses like spotting specialized meter phenomena like D/Ns and rocket reads, I think it would be wise to stick with the traditional method. Because I deal mainly in engram running rather than Scn-style processing, I don't need to worry about exotic reads. I just want to know if and how much something reads on the Pc, and what in general is going on in the Pc's universe from moment to moment during a process.

Robert D.

Paul's Independent Academy Presents:

Telepathic Metering 4

By Robert Ducharme
October 30, 2003

From a post to the
Freezone America Board:
Posted October 30, 2003.

The funny thing about telephone auditing is that anybody could do it and it would expand the auditing field tremendously, and yet I note so little being mentioned about it.
As for "telepathic metering", nothing could be simpler or more natural, providing one has a sensitive enough meter. I use a Clarity meter with a homemade clear plastic tone arm disk and the sensitivity set at 32. I can't imagine that anybody here couldn't get reads telepathically when auditing someone. And the reads are quite reliable. When I see a blowdown, I know something has changed for the Pc. When I see an F/N, I know that an end of cycle has been reached.
I used to have (and sometimes still do) an often recurring dream, that I was finding piles of valuable and not so valuable coins on the ground and everybody else around walked by ignoring it all while I got busy scooping it up. I don't know if that was a metaphor for the tech I've been using or the financial gains from doing that, however moderate. In any case, I see a virtually unlimited market for people who would like to get over deaths of loved ones or past traumas and mishaps, locate the cause of their children's depression, clear up their floundering relationships, etc. There are many avenues by which to advertise this - new age publications for starters. I'm only one person and I have no way of being able to handle that many potential Pc's, not to mention students, on my own. There's a whole world out there that is suffering and wishing for answers.

We don't need to start with formal orgs. We could start with processing out peoples' engrams and past upsets. Do it with Dianetics and it can all be done easily by phone. One possible bridge for the beginners (whether auditors or Pcs) would be to clear up their entire present lifetimes with four-flow lock scanning on all the stressful incidents of this lifetime, done using the tools and techniques contained in the R3X write-up. That alone could keep a lot of people busy for a long time.
Whatever is done, any action is better than no action. The only thing I would caution people to do is to get formally trained somewhere (Rey Robles' place in Sedona, Arizona, for instance) so that one can be equipped to have and maintain a continuous streak of successful sessions. Nothing is more depressing for an auditor than to give his Pcs losses. Auditors with continuing

overts on auditing will eventually quit the practice altogether one way or another. The best way of ensuring a perfect track record is to make sure that no session is ended off with anything less than an F/N and VGIs - or at the very least a flat point and a red flag.
I believe we have the makings of an internet-centered org with the telephone as the main vehicle for auditing. People only need to believe that it can be done. Once enough people found out and told other people about this, then there could be an eventual critical mass reached where it would become "the thing to do", and eventually at some point, even the mainstream media could no longer ignore scn tech.
But the way to start is by doing something that one has certainty on (Dianetic auditing, for instance) and building on that.
I'm reminded of two old sayings: "Every journey begins with the first step." and "Watch out for that first step, it's a doozie." :-) The latter one can be mitigated with proper formal training.

Robert D.

Paul's Independent Academy Presents:

Telepathic Metering 5

By Robert Ducharme

November 14, 2003

From a post to the
Freezone America Board:
Posted November 14, 2003.

Why everyone doesn't just try out telepathic metering is a mystery to me. It's very simple. You just get on a meter - I use the Clarity at sensitivity 32 - and run a simple process like Straightwire on another person while holding the cans and watch for meter reactions. That's all there is to it. There's no mental preparation, no "right thinking", no ceremonial dancing, or any other additive needed. You just audit as usual except that you're holding onto the cans instead of the Pc. Now I won't guarantee you can do L&Ns successfully this way (I won't say you can't, either) but it is very useful when doing Dianetic auditing and you want to keep track of how the Pc is progressing. I find it invaluable for this purpose. But now I don't have to rely on the Pc's conscious reality. I can immediately tell if a process is not flat yet or if something is changing in the Pc's space.

The added bonus is that the auditor can better track with a Pc the way only auditors who can see Pcs' pictures have been able to do. Those are the auditors who have had a reputation for being a cut above everyone else. But now anyone can have that advantage with the help of the meter.

Robert D.

Paul's Independent Academy Presents:

Auditing Business Idea

By Robert Ducharme
September 26, 2002

From a post to the Yahoo formerscio list:
From: "Robert D."
Date: Thu Sep 26, 2002.
Subject: Auditing business idea

Here's an idea I just thought about recently for promoting one's auditing practice, that seems to have every reason to be workable.
Get with a major Unitarian Church, Unity Church, or some major New Age store and set oneself up as a spiritual healer for a few set hours a week, say on Saturday afternoons from 1 to 6 pm or something like that. Do a few simple Dianetic sessions on people with traumas on their cases (kind of like they do with Book-1 at orgs) and give out business cards afterwards. The sessions would be free, but they would sure know who to go to for further assistance if they needed it in the future. And they would know who to refer their friends to.

Doing Dianetic auditing the way I prescribe, narrative style with the help of 6-Dir process when needed, would make for fast clearing of people's problems in short order.
I just handled an old friend today, on his son's death from lingering effects of a stroke. It took about 15 minutes to clear up a continuous condition of depression and grieving that had been going on ever since it became apparent to him that his son was going to die. At the end of the session said he was feeling happy and was amazed by the fact that I could do this and told me he'd tell others about me. I'd told him before what I did, but it took this kind of event for it to really sink in.

With the simple techniques I use and have outlined on the R3XD write-up and in the formerscio archives, I can successfully handle any case that presents itself whether advanced or "raw meat". I see no reason whatsoever why a trained Dianetic auditor couldn't make a living practicing his craft. I find it a crying shame that more don't. I'd love to see more competition in the field. And I'd like to see an association of what could be called "general clearing practitioners" like myself, not people who are tied to a "fixed bridge system" (though that is necessary in its own right), but people who can deliver whatever it is people want delivered and can do it all expertly. We really do need to make greater inroads into the raw public arena.

Paul's Independent Academy Presents:

Auditing as a Career

By Robert Ducharme
August 28, 2004

From: "Robert D."
Date: Sat Aug 28, 2004 3:53 pm
Subject: Auditing as a career

Many people got trained in the church for the purpose of devoting their lives to a career in the field of Scn as an auditor. Unfortunately the church experience has been a bitter disappointment for most. And we see very few of these people practicing their craft in the free zone.
The main reasons for this include:

1. Disinterest in the subject,
2. Preferred interest in other areas, like family, higher-paying jobs/careers, etc.,
3. Fear of the church's influence,
4. Ignorance regarding marketing,
5. State laws regarding counseling,
6. An inability to achieve 100% reliable results on their clients.

Numbers 1 and 2 are understandable. Some people don't like auditing just like some don't like art or engineering while others do. Some would rather be involved in a "real world" profession that has already gained acceptance and automatically pays high salaries. Some simply don't like the idea of dealing with peoples' cases.

Number 3 is understandable from the standpoint that one's close friends and loved ones may be involved directly with the church and one would rather remain "in the closet" regarding free zone activities in order to not jeopardize those relationships. I consider personal freedom a high price to pay for maintained relations, but it's that individual's choice to make for his own reasons.
As far as fear of retaliation by the church for "squirrel" activities is concerned, well, I suppose that tends to happen only in areas heavily populated with Scios (with a capital "S") like Los Angeles. I don't know how founded these fears are, but I would tend to look for some way out of that box and "start living".

Number 4 is also understandable. An auditor on his own has to pull himself up by his own bootstraps, pushing a profession that has little agreement in the wog world. But there are enough scios (with a small "s") outside the church alone to provide one with clientele. But there is also a proliferation of publications that are tailor made for an auditor to pitch his trade. Such magazines as the ubiquitous pulp new age and health magazines, some of which are distributed free, are possible avenues of advertisement. The practice of bringing a resolution to a troubled mind is a valid, valuable and a viable one. The more people find out about it, the more viable it will become in time.

Number 5 should not become an impediment. In Florida we are fortunate that counseling laws are liberal. Anyone can legally call himself a counselor. In some states one must meet certain educational criteria and be certified by the state to call himself a counselor and charge a fee. An option is to become a minister and come under the cloak of religion. The Universal Life Church (www.ULC.org) offers ministerial certificates on demand.

Number 6 has unfortunately been a valid impediment--that is until the advent of R3X.

What R3X does is to open the doors to the possibility of running Dianetic counseling on anyone and everyone with equal success. No, not equal results, but equal degree of success. In other words, the tech *is* so standard that it applies to everyone across the board whether they have had set-up procedures or not; whether they are non-Scios, intermediate Scios, or pre-OTs.

As LRH once said in HCOB 7 April 1960, "Engram running from 'away back' works so well that I probably would not have advanced auditing technically to any degree, if people at large had been able to apply Book One engram running as given in 1950." Of course LRH was missing a few factors that could have brought that about, like havingness, a rote basic procedure, debugging techniques, engram running by chains, TRs, metering, admin, a standard course with checksheet, and study tech.

So now one can achieve results with R3X that are as predictable as those of a dentist or optometrist. It's up to us as to how widespread we want the knowledge of Dianetic counseling as an acceptable professional practice to become.

Robert D.

Command Sheets and Notes

This section gives the most used processes. First section gives the basic processes in no particular order. It's followed by Session Notes on specific actions and Rundowns. See also chapters like "Abridged Recap of R3X" (p. 77), "Shift Handling Checklist" (p. 82) and "R3X Procedure" (p. 42). The original issues take precedence if any conflicts.

Basic R3X (From R3X Procedure)

1. Establish which item is to be run. Get wording that fits feeling.
2. Locate an incident where you had the feeling of (item).
3. When was it?
4. Move to that incident.
5. What is the duration of that incident?
6. Move to a point just before that began. (...and tell me when you are there)
7. What do you see? (omit on very short incidents)
8. Move through to the end of that incident.
9. Okay, continue (if needed)
10. What happened?
11. Move to the beginning of that incident.
12. Move through to the end of that incident.
13. Ask: What happened?
14. How does the incident seem now (by comparison) (with the last time through)?
15. Is there another (or an earlier") incident where you had the feeling of (item)?
16. When was it?
17. Is there an earlier beginning to this incident?
18. Move to the new beginning/ What do you see?

Running Pre-MEST Incidents (From R3X Procedure)

Is there an earlier incident, possibly before the beginning of time, where you had (item)?"
Is there an earlier incident, possibly around the original separation from Static, where you had (item)?
Move to a point just before that began
(the rest of the procedure is the same as Basic R3X)

Alternate Confront (From R3X Procedure)

What part of that incident could you confront?
What part of that incident would you rather not confront?

Alternate Responsibility (From R3X Procedure)
What part of that incident could you be responsible for?
What part of that incident would you rather not be responsible for?

Before/After process (From Lock Scanning in R3X)
Spot a moment before the (incident, period of time, series of incidents, etc.)
Spot a moment after the (incident, etc.)

6-Dir process (From Charged Terminal RD)
Get the concept of (terminal/item)
Put it above you. Put it below you.
Put it to the right of you. Put it to the left of you.
Put it in front of you. Put it in back of you.

Special Attention Process
All start "Move to the beginning of the incident." Then:
Occluded: With particular attention to anything hidden, suppressed, overwhelming, invisible or occluded, or has (contains) unconsciousness, move through to the end of the incident (or series of incidents)
Effort: With particular attention to any force, energies, masses, resistance, efforts, pressure, impact, barriers, (violence, drugs - if applicable), move through to the end of the incident (or series of incidents).
Emotion: With particular attention to any emotions, feelings or reactions, pains, sensations, attitudes, protest, move through to the end of the incident (or series of incidents).
Thought: With particular attention to any thoughts, fixed ideas, decisions, postulates, implanted commands, beliefs, agreements, move through to the end of the incident (or series of incidents).
Shock: With particular attention to any shock moment that might be there, move through to the end of the incident.
Comm Lines: With particular attention to any comm (or communication) lines move through to the end of the incident.

Shock Moment

0. (Special Attention Processes already run on incident.)
1. Is there a moment of shock in the incident?
2. The Before/After process: "Spot a moment before the shock" "Spot a moment after the shock"
3. Six-Direction process on Shock segment
4. Basic R3X: "Move through that moment of shock from beginning to end." Repeatedly until flat.
5. Name the relevant other viewpoints (persons involved) in the incident. Run each:
6. "From the viewpoint of ...(person's name)...move through that moment of shock from beginning to end" repeatedly until flat.
7. From a pan-determined viewpoint move through that moment of shock from beginning to end" repeatedly until flat.
8. Check if there are any later shocks that are relevant and run those too if necessary. Usually running the initial shock is sufficient.
9. (Special Attention Processes can be run on the Shock segment as well.)

Lock Scanning

Move to the beginning of that period of time.
Move through to the end of that period of time with regard to (or "on the subject of") [the marriage].
What happened?

Sample Four Flows Lock Scanning

From this [point in time] forward to [point/present], scan through...
F1: ...all the incidents where you [had the feeling of 'item'].
F2: ...all the incidents where you caused another or others [to have the feeling of 'item'].
F3: ...all the incidents where others caused others or themselves [to have the feeling of 'item').
F0: ...all the incidents where you caused yourself [to have the feeling of 'item'].

Havingness Commands (or choose other Hav Prcs Pc likes)

Put out eight anchor points." "Now allow them to remain where they are.
Put out eight anchor points." "Now throw them away.
Put out eight anchor points" "Now do whichever you want with them.
The last command is repeated to a release point. Usually around 5 to 10 commands suffices.

Then:

Spot an object" (to release)

Charged Terminal RD, Notes

0. Determine which terminal is to be run. Use 2-way communication or assessment.
1. Run 6-Directions on general form of terminal
"Get the concept of (a father)"
"Put it above you" "Put it below you"
"Put it to the right of you" "Put it to the left of you"
"Put it in front of you" "Put it in back of you"

2. Establish the *span of time* to address regarding that terminal.
The entire relationship/lifetime or a segment of time. Also, segment by segment.
3. Clear how Flow 2 and 3 works (may not include terminal directly).
4. Clear use of "With regard to..." or "On the subject of ___" or "With respect to ___", or "Concerning ___" or "As regards ___".
All are used interchangeably, meaning the same thing.

5. Run the scanning process, each flow to EP.
Move to the beginning of that period of time.
From that point forward to (date/point), with regard to (general terminal), scan through all the incidents where...
(Flow 1)...*you experienced stress.*
(Flow 2)...*you caused another or others to experience stress.*
(Flow 3)...*others caused others or themselves to experience stress.*
(Flow 0)...*you caused yourself to experience stress.*

The scanning can be interspersed with the 6-Dir on terminal. End off with scanning.

If charged incidents show up (heavy engram or secondary), address each single incident with Basic R3X till flat.
Then return to the scanning of relationship per above.

6. Scan session:
Move to the beginning of this session
Move through to the end of this session

7. Run Pc's **Havingness processes.**

Lifetime Scanning, Notes

Apply to larger segments of Pc's present life. Pc's entire life can systematically be addressed, segment by segment.
Each segment taken up is run this way:
a) general scan on "period of time" (no flows);
b) run on 6-Dir.;
c) additional scans (a) and 6-Dir (b) as needed;
d) scan by 4 flows;
e) general scan on "series of incidents" (no flows).

Start with a period the Pc complains about, usually recent times. Could be past week or month. Keep this up until Pc isn't drawn into recent out rudiment situations.
Then run "since the beginning of the year".
Then a fairly recent past period of time that might have been turbulent. (Maybe several).
Sometimes the duration of present relationships are good to scan out.
This above depends on the situation and auditor's judgment of what is charged, has Pc's interest and is available.
Scan the first few years of the person's life.
Then Pc's whole life in about ten year increments, but adjusted for the individual.

General Scan, Period of Time
"Move to the beginning of that period of time" (can be specified)
"From that point forward to [date/point], move through to the end of that period of time"
[auditor can add *"and tell me when you're done so"* if he wishes]

Note: If charged incidents show up in any scanning (heavy engram or secondary), address each single incident right away with Basic R3X--and possibly 6-Dir till flat. Then return to the scanning per above.

Six-Direction process
"Get the idea of that period of time"
"Put it above you" "Put it below you"
"Put it to the right of you" "Put it to the left of you"
"Put it in front of you" "Put it in back of you"

Four Flows Scan
"Move to the beginning of that period of time" (can be specified)
Flow 1: *"From that point forward to [point], scan through all the incidents where you experienced stress"*
Flow 2: *"From that point forward to [point], scan through all the incidents where you caused another or others to experience stress"*
Flow 3: *"From that point forward to [point], scan through all the incidents where others caused others or themselves to experience stress"*
Flow 0: *"From that point forward to [point], scan through all the incidents where you caused yourself to experience stress"*

General Scan, Series of Incidents
"Move to the beginning of that series of incidents" (can be specified)
"From that point forward to [date/point], move through to the end of that series of incidents"
[auditor can add *"and tell me when you're done so"* if he wishes]

R3XD: R3X by Dynamics, Notes

1. Start by getting the dynamic to be run fully defined.
2. Ask the Pc to: *"expand your space to encompass the (specific) dynamic".*
3. *"Locate an incident where you experienced the (specific) dynamic."*
4. Followed by all R3X steps.
R3XD should always be taken back to Basic-Basic and the Shift handled.

Entity Handling, Notes

0. Pc originates there is an entity in his space.
1. Find out if entity is demanding attention and interfering in present time or simply getting unstuck from the incident being run.
2. On entities interfering: Educate your Pc on how to address entities:
a) focus directly on it; b) maintain a neutral attitude; c) telepathic communication d) acknowledge entity answers.
In other words, the entity, in principle, is treated as any other Pc.

3. Get the Pc to locate the entity in space/time.
4. If needed, have the Pc run "Hello and Okay" on entity:
"Say 'hello' to the entity." "Have the entity say 'okay' to that hello."
"Have the entity say 'hello' to you." "Say 'okay' to that hello."
Done until the Pc knows he's in good communication with the entity.
5. Have the Pc ask the entity *"What are you?"* (meaning: "What game are you playing?" or "What's your role in game?")
6. Pc tells entity: *"Move to that incident."*
Pc asks: *"What are you aware of there?"* (find peaceful point, before turmoil, if needed)
Pc tells entity: *"Move through to the end of the incident (or series of incidents if applicable)".*
These commands are run again as needed to run out the incident to completely flat.
7. Optional: 6-Dir may be used on entity: *"Have the entity put the incident above him, below, right ...(etc.)"*
No need to acknowledge your Pc on each of these commands. Pc should ack entity.
8. Rarely, the entity will have an earlier similar or another incident to run. If so, then go through the same procedure again. This rarely happens, so don't count on it occurring.
8a. Optional: If entity was stuck on MEST (machinery, base, etc.) have your Pc run 6-Dir on entity on each item involved.
9. Optional: When the entity is finally doing well and is free, you can have the client read him his rights by repeating these lines to him:
"You have the right to your own sanity and self determinism."
"You have the right to play or leave the game."
"We are not holding you, no one can."
"If you wish you can stay and help us clean up this game."
10. Have your Pc give the entity the command:
"Point to the being you individuated from".

By this time the entity should be free.

Glossary

The glossary covers special R3X terms and terms needed in session. It's a supplement to a general Dianetics glossary as can be found in the book "Dianetics Today!", Dianetics course packs and elsewhere.

Auditing: the action or practice of processing a client (Pc), using formal techniques and processes based on two way communication. Dianetics, as well as R3X, are examples of auditing.

Auditor: Practitioner of Dianetics, R3X and similar techniques.

Basic-Basic Incident: In R3X theory it's the very first incident on the track "before the beginning of time" or "around the Original Separation from Theta". All subsequent incidents derive their basic charge from this Basic-Basic Incident. The Basic-Basic on a chain is never a MEST universe incident. In practice, one goes back in time, way back, until one reaches "before time", "before this universe", or "around the separation" and will find a highly charged incident. For practical reasons, this is called Basic-Basic, whether it's the same incident for all chains or not. It could be different aspects of the same incident or a group of incidents in a "timeless" area.

Basic Incident: Any incident, where no apparent earlier incident exists on the chain, and where the charge at least appears to be erased, can be called a Basic Incident. Auditor may suspect it is well short of Basic-Basic on the chain but can't get any further back.

Bridge: See 'Scientology'.

Charge: Harmful mental energy stored in the Pcs case. It can be reactivated in stressful situations and cause all kinds of negative mental and physical effects. Auditing is designed to find the basic causes of charge and release it permanently.

C/S: Case Supervisor. A senior technical person that on a daily basis inspects auditing reports and gives directions to the auditor for the next session. He also writes programs to follow for whole series of sessions.

C/S'ing: the work of a C/S. Writing programs and doing other planning of what to do in future sessions. Part of this is to evaluate results of last session or larger segments of past auditing and make sure any non-optimal situation is repaired. Ideally C/S'ing is done by an external C/S but often experienced auditors, working on their own, have to take care of it themselves.

Dianetics: An incident running technique developed by L. Ron Hubbard and first published in 1950 in "Dianetics, Modern Science of Mental Health". Subsequent major developments were published in 1969 (Standard Dianetics) and 1978 (New Era Dianetics).

Dynamics: The basic urge (or dynamic force) of life can be described as "urge to survive". This "Survive" can be subdivided into 8 urges--each directed towards a sphere of vital interest. These 8 spheres combined, cover all activities and things an individual is concerned about. This is the 8 Dynamics. The Dynamics are: First Dynamic: Survival for self and personal belongings. Second Dynamic: a) Survival through the sexual act. b) Survival for family, and as a family member, and for family belongings. Third Dynamic: Survival for groups, and as a group member, and group belongings. Fourth Dynamic: Survival for mankind, and as a human being, and belongings to Man as a species. Fifth Dynamic: Survival of all life forms, animals and plants of any kind. Sixth Dynamic: Survival for the physical universe as a playing field and a supplier of physical things. Seventh Dynamic: Survival for spiritual things, for self and others as spirits. It includes spiritual activities, such as art, literature, etc. Eighth Dynamic: Survival for infinity or God or "All-there-is", and being part of all-there-is.

End Phenomena (EP): The positive end results of a process or series of processes. It consists of very good indicators; the Pc feels happy and released from charge on the subject audited. It also includes realizations on the subject. One ends a process or series of processes at this optimum point.

Engram: A mental recording of an incident containing pain and unconsciousness, such as of an injury, accident, etc.

Entities: What appears to be separate and distinct life-units in the Pc's space or vicinity. They can be made to respond to auditing. Usually they are better left alone but occasionally one has to address them as described in the chapter "Handling Entities".

File Clerk: A mechanism of the mind that acts as a data monitor. When the Pc is asked a charged question, the File Clerk will automatically present an answer that is ready to be run. The item the auditor can use usually comes to the Pc's mind in a flash.

Flat: When a process produces no more change, without any spectacular change in the Pc, it is said to be Flat. The charge available has been reduced as much as possible and it's time to move on to another technique to get the full End Phenomena for the subject being audited. Minor processes are often run to Flat only, while an overall series of processes on a subject should be run to EP.

Flows: A flow is the direction of an action, communication or energy. We talk about 4 principal

flows. Flow 1: From others to self (in-flow). Flow 2: from self to others (out-flow). Flow 3: from another/others to another/others (cross-flow). Flow 0: From self to self (reflexive flow).

GPM; Goals-Problem-Mass: A mental mass that was brought about by long-standing conflicting goals. The goals in conflict were, at one time or other, personal goals pursued. As this is recorded, yet unresolved, it's a basic problem to the Being. GPMs often result in repeated irrational behavior over vast periods of time as the Being tends to act out the basic conflicts they contain, again and again. One way to address GPMs is running R3X by Dynamics.

Grinding: When an incident does not seem to reduce or reveal new content, despite repeated runs, we have Grinding. One has to look for an earlier beginning, earlier incident, or other aspects or ways to reduce and erase.

Implant: An incident of overwhelm, usually by electronic means, in order to subdue and control a Being. It's a practice of mind control or "brain washing" that routinely can be found in whole-track incidents. Implants typically contain conflicting goals given as "hypnotic commands". Such incidents are sometimes called Implant GPMs. They look like GPMs but are really engrams.

Itsa: The act of the Pc saying "it is a...". The Pc is discovering things in his auditing and is expressing them clearly and with certainty.

Lock: A mental recording of a lightly traumatic incident. It locks onto (restimulates) existing secondaries and engrams because of similarity in content. The real force is in the underlying incidents. The Lock itself does not contain injury or loss. Locks can be run with benefit, but until the underlying incidents are handled, results may not be permanent.

Lock Scanning: Technique where long periods of time, such as years or a whole life, is reviewed for traumatic content. It is designed to remove surface charge and get an overview of what needs to be addressed by other and more in-depth techniques. One can specify what types of incidents to lock scan, such as "related to work", "related to marriage", etc. Lock Scanning, thus, addresses multiple incidents in each run.

LRH: L. Ron Hubbard. The developer of Dianetics and Scientology. Author of many of the processes used in R3X.

Meter; E-meter: Electronic instrument that measures electrical resistance. It is fine-tuned so it can detect charge on a case. It measures charge and changes of charge and helps the auditor determine what to audit next and when a process is completed.

Original Separation from Theta: This is based on the philosophy, that each spirit or thetan separated from one Divine or Supreme Being before the beginning of time and before the beginning of this or any other universe. These data, despite how incredulous they may seem, are workable in auditing.

Pc: Processee. A person receiving processing or auditing. Originally: Pre-clear; a person receiving processing in order to become Clear, which is a high state on the Bridge.

R3R; Routine 3 Revised: Basic incident running process. It is used to run single incidents or chains of incidents. The main technique of Standard Dianetics.

R3X; Routine 3 Expanded: a series of techniques used to run and erase (completely discharge) incidents and thus erase their negative influence on the Pc. Basic R3X is the technique used to handle a chain of incidents, one incident at the time.

R3XD; Routine 3 Expanded by Dynamics: Using R3X techniques to specifically address a whole dynamic as an item, one dynamic at the time.

Repeater Technique: Pc repeats a charged statement, he has run into, numerous times in order to bleed the charge off. After a number of repeats, this statement will go flat and that's the end of it. Pc repeats the exact statement, decision, or postulate without trying to run it any other way.

Revenius: alias Ralph Hilton. A practitioner of Dianetics and Scientology living in Austria. He has developed a number of advanced techniques and did some work on R3X and R3XD.

Rudiments (Ruds): Processes used at the beginning of a Standard Dianetics session in order to get the Pc focused on the task at hand. Recent upsets, problems, etc. are briefly addressed to enable the Pc to leave them behind at least for the duration of the session. "Out rudiments" usually describes a Pc that is upset, distracted, or otherwise out of communication. The Rudiments are designed to remedy that.

Scientology (Scn): An applied philosophy and technology (tech) developed by L. Ron Hubbard. The tech consists of formal auditing processes delivered to a Pc. The processes are organized in grades and levels that, as a whole, is called the Bridge. The Bridge goes from beginning steps to high states of being. Major states attained are "Clear" and "Operating Thetan" (OT). OT is the ultimate state envisioned. A Pre-OT is someone working on the OT levels.

Secondary: A mental recording of an incident containing loss or fear of loss, such as the death of a loved one, bankruptcy, etc.

Shift: A Shift from an original expansive identity or viewpoint--to an identity or viewpoint drastically reduced in size and power. The Shift Handling addresses this aspect of the Basic-Basic incident of a chain with a battery of processes. The Shift evidently contains no time, and yet it contains all the postulates in the incident. It is the "prior cause" in the incident, and so is the important part of it.

Shock: It's similar to the Shift, except it happened later on the chain than Basic-Basic incident--or at least after the Shift. Also, the Pc was more effect; more in a state of Shock in the normal meaning of the word. It can be addressed as a highly charged segment of an incident. "The moment of shock" is that period of realization by body and thetan that an overwhelming has occurred." Sometimes "Shock" and "Shift" are used synonymously.

Six-Direction Process (6-Dir): The Pc is asked to get the concept of a charged item, be it an incident, a time period, or a terminal, and subsequently place it Above him, Below him, To the Right, To the Left, In Front of him, Back of him (6 directions). Doing this process tends to reduce the charge of the item that then usually is processed further with other techniques.

Special Attention Process: The Special Attention process is used whenever the Pc has encountered an area of track that is particularly charged and occluded. One would use this process on heavy engrams, implant incidents, GPMs, etc. Normally, this-lifetime incidents are not charged enough to need this process. The Pc is told to go through the incident "with particular attention to___", where the blank covers, "occlusion", "effort", "emotion", "thought", "shock", "communications lines". (see chapter on subject for exact commands).

Standard Dianetics: Incident running techniques developed by L. Ron Hubbard and published in 1969. The subject and the techniques are fully covered in the book "Dianetics Today!" (1975). R3X uses basic concepts from Standard Dianetics and builds on its techniques.

Terminal: Anything that can give or receive communication. In auditing, it is typically a person, group or ting in the Pc's life. A 'charged Terminal' is likewise a person, group or thing the Pc has charge on.

Thetan: At the core of a person we have the awareness of awareness unit. That's the person as a spirit, his immortal self. It's one life unit, originally separated from theta.

TRs; Training Routines: Drills in how to handle the communications of a session and what is called 'the auditing communications cycle'. An auditor with 'good TRs' is effective, smooth and gets results; while an auditor with 'bad TRs' may have "inexplicable" difficulties with Pc's in session.